The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

WHEN do events become history, and when does history become a reserved subject for historians whose conclusions we ordinary people accept as we accept the findings of experts in other fields of knowledge? These questions have arisen in our mind as the result of two otherwise quite unrelated incidents. A correspondent, who being a Christian believer accepts the interventions of God in history, who accepts the doctrine of the Incarnation, doubtless reads the Hebrew prophets and so knows something of Amos, Jeremiah and Isaiah, may occasionally look into the Books of *Kings* and *Chronicles* and is familiar with the Epistle to the *Hebrews* 11 and 12, nevertheless objects to the suggestion in these notes in our last issue that the mighty hand of God might be perceived in the history of these recent years of our peril—and not ours only. That God may be perceived in history has been the faith of a long line of saints and scholars at whose feet we humbly sit, but we are left wondering, when does history catch up with events? Like Moses, we, from our cleft in the rock, are only permitted to see the back parts of God, perceive Him when He has passed by, which was, you remember, the plaint of the Psalmist, We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us what Thou hast done in their time of old. . . . For they gat not their land in possession through their own sword, neither was it their own hand that helped them: but Thy right hand and Thine arm and the light of Thy countenance. But God in his own time and situation, he could not perceive. As for ourselves, we beg leave to follow, albeit afar off, the good Isaac Watts, who in the preface to his published sermon on the death of George I wrote: 'I must acknowledge, that when any great and momentous changes arise in the world, it is my custom, in the course of my ministry, to excite my hearers to a pious notice and improvement of them'.

* * *

THE other incident is the recently reported assertion of an eminent ecclesiastical dignitary that the 'martyr King' Charles I "died for the Church of England". One would think that an event which happened in 1649 would by 1949 have taken its place in history, interpreted, appraised and accepted by all intelligent people. The evidence is all in, reduced to writing, and has long been open to

scrutiny. But apparently the same words mean different things to different people. Not so long ago, the commemorators of 'the martyr King' were a handful of eccentrics some of them claiming a rather dubious descent from the martyred King's son, but now speeches are made and even sermons preached by men whose ability and distinction make it impossible for anyone to describe their utterances as nonsense, but which leave us asking what kind of sense it is. Mr. Maurice Ashley, writing in *The Spectator*, asked for us as well as for himself, whether it is really to be asserted that the conflict in England in the seventeenth century was "between a gang of unscrupulous plutocrats and a monarch who truly represented the nation?" "Can we say", he goes on, "that we regret that a system of parliamentary supremacy was evolved in this country, or that our ancestors were spared the rule of a Louis XIV, a Peter the Great, a Frederick William I or a Napoleon? . . . The Puritans regarded the Roman Catholic Church with the same kind of aversion as that with which Englishmen in the third decade of the twentieth century regarded Fascist and National Socialist dictatorships". Indeed the same issues were at stake in England in the seventeenth century, in Europe during the Thirty Years' War and throughout the world in our two Great Wars. John Morley's 'Cromwell' and Carlyle's 'Cromwell's Letters and Speeches' make good reading nowadays.

The events of the seventeenth century must be regarded in the light of their own time. No great principle of government or social conduct is fully developed at its birth. Men in the midst of battle are not commonly tolerant, even when they are fighting for toleration. There are always tares in the wheat. The final comment on the Puritans as statesmen and men of religion is written into English and American history. In the crisis of the abdication of Edward VIII, Mr. Churchill, who never failed in friendship to the King, is reported to have said, 'When the King quarrels with the constitution, it is the King that goes'. If that principle had been known in Europe, as it has been known in England since the days of the Puritans, the world would have been spared much.

* * *

THE earlier mention of the great name of Isaac Watts recalls the recent commemorations throughout the country. In London a service was held in St. Paul's and the Free Church Council arranged a meeting, which like the service was but sparsely attended. Worthily as we were represented by preacher and speaker, Dr. Peel at St. Paul's and Dr. Nuttall at the Free Church Council meeting, was not an opportunity missed of impressing our historic witness on the mind of the country? It is true of course that Watts now belongs to the whole church of Christ, but so do we. But some of those who spoke most thankfully of his supreme service to Christian hymnody forgot to mention, or did not know, that he was a Congregational minister,

whose church was not the least important of the channels through which flowed his lovely and glorious gifts to Christendom. If the Universities of his time were what Gibbon declared them to be in *his* time, and he tried them both, it was no misfortune that he was excluded from Oxford by his Nonconformity. Indeed we may reflect, not for the first or last time, that exclusion sometimes punishes the excluder more severely than the excluded. Dr. C. J. Wright, for example, preached a fine memorial sermon in Canterbury Cathedral without mentioning that there were such people as Congregationalists, either then or now, and Mr. George Sampson's beautiful tribute in *The Spectator* after saying very truly that "The hymns of Watts are like the man himself, quite unsectarian", goes on "There never was a 'Wattsian Church' and never will be". Of course not. Why should there be? How could there be? Watts was the minister of a Congregational Church where freedom in the faith was not only practised but preached, preached not to his own people only, but to all who had ears to hear. And what he preached, he sang, and so do we. Christian freedom is still a noble and inspiring faith. We have no monopoly of it and desire only that the Church and the world should share our treasure. Why does our trumpet give forth so uncertain a sound now when it is needed in the world as it was needed in England in the seventeenth century?

* * *

HERE is a 'believe it or believe it not' story. It sounds too good to be true, but is attested out of the mouths of many living witnesses. It was told at a church meeting following the Watts celebrations at Fish Street Memorial Church, Hull. The Sunday morning service had, of course, included the hymn 'Awake our souls, away our fears' with its splendid last verse beginning 'Swift as an eagle cuts the air'. For many years it had been impossible to sing that hymn at the old Fish Street Church for the extraordinary reason that there was a much respected member of the church whose name was Eagle and who was, incredibly, a barber!

* * *

THE International Congregational Council is to meet in June at Wellesley College, Boston, U.S.A. Representatives from this country, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand have been invited. We hope to publish in due course some account of the proceedings and any recommendations the Council may make to its constituent Unions. The detailed programme is not yet available, but it is intended that the morning sessions shall be given to some consideration of the Reports of the four preparatory commissions submitted to the World Council of Churches which met at Amsterdam. The afternoon sessions will review the practical work of our Churches throughout the world, Home Missions, Social service,

Youth work, Women's work and the like, and the evenings will be filled with a series of public meetings. Add to all this, official and unofficial committees and sub-committees and then reflect that it is all to happen in Boston in June! The British delegation may be counted upon to make a worthy contribution. Dr. Sidney Berry is, of course, the Council's Minister and Secretary, the Rev. Leslie Cooke is to preach the Conference sermon, and Sir Oliver Franks, British Ambassador at Washington, who has added such varied distinction to an honoured Congregational name, is to address the first public meeting on "The Spiritual Factor in International Affairs". Rev. Maurice Watts, Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall and Dr. John Marsh are among others who have been invited to speak.

* * *

SOME important preparatory work was begun by a representative Anglo-American committee at Bournemouth last summer, including a draft constitution, which if it is adopted by the Council and accepted by the constituent Unions, will formally constitute the international organization of Congregationalism. We print it here for the scrutiny of our readers.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL

The evangelical and reformed churches of the world which are organized

(*a*) in national unions of Congregational churches, or

(*b*) in communions which in part spring from Congregational churches and maintain the principles of Congregational churchmanship, or

(*c*) as communions or groups of churches ordered after the Christian faith and Congregational polity,

recognizing their unity in Christ and their duty of common witness both before the world and before their fellow Christians of other communions, and acting as they believe in obedience to Christ, the only Head of the Church, do hereby adopt the following Constitution.

I—NAME

The name of this body is "The International Congregational Council".

II—PURPOSE

The purpose of this International Congregational Council is to promote regular consultation and effective co-operation among its constituent churches; to devise measures and maintain agencies for the advancement of their common witness; and to strengthen the Congregational contribution to the World Council of Churches and to the ecumenical movement generally.

III—MEMBERSHIP

The International Congregational Council shall consist of not more than 235 members allotted as follows:—

From the churches of the U.S.A.	...	...	75
From the churches of the British Isles	...		75
From other constituent churches	...	...	75

These delegates shall be elected by the constituent bodies to which they belong. The Council may at its discretion elect not more than ten members on the nomination of the Executive Committee.

IV—Officers

The officers of the Council shall be (*a*) a Moderator who shall be elected at such time and in such manner as shall be determined by the Council from members of the Council nominated by constituent churches, shall be installed at the conclusion of the last session of the Council, and shall hold office until his successor has been elected and installed; (*b*) such assistant Moderators as may be desired; (*c*) an executive officer called Minister and Secretary, who shall be elected for a term of five years; (*d*) such assistant secretaries as may be desired; (*e*) a treasurer who shall be elected for a term of five years.

V—Committees of the Council

The committees of the Council shall be (*a*) an Executive Committee of fifteen members elected by the Council and holding office for five years; the Executive Committee shall have power to do all the work of the Council between the meetings of the Council, and to appoint necessary sub-committees; (*b*) a Nominating Committee which shall present nominations for the Executive Committee and for all officers except the Moderator; (*c*) any other such committees as the Council may desire. Casual vacancies shall be filled by the Executive Committee until the next meeting of the Council.

VI—Meetings

The Council shall meet at intervals of five years, or at such time as the Council or Executive Committee shall determine.

VII—Amendments

This constitution may be amended at any meeting of the Council by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting, provided that notice of the amendment has been circulated with the call to the meeting.

* * *

More interesting is the statement of what Congregationalism is and stands for within the ecumenical Church and in the world, which will be submitted to the Council for consideration and possible adoption, with or without amendment. If it is adopted, it is, we believe, intended that it shall be sent by the Council to its constituent Unions for any use they may care to make of it. This draft is the work of two distinguished English theologians, whose names are a sufficient guarantee that it is historically sound and theologically orthodox. We commend it to our readers' careful consideration, believing that an agreed statement of what Congregationalism stands for in a dissolving world will be of very great service, both to ourselves at home and abroad, and throughout the Christian Church.

CONGREGATIONALISM in itself, in its significance for the universal Church and for the political and economic life of the World.

A Congregational Church is in principle a covenant fellowship, binding the members to God and to one another through Christ, the Head of the Church.

Richard Mather in the seventeenth century defined a covenant thus: "a solemne and publick promise before the Lord, whereby a company of Christians, called by the power and mercy of God to fellowship with Christ, and by His providence to live together, and by His grace to cleave together in the unitie of faith and brotherly love, and desirous to partake together in all the holy Ordinances of God, doe in confidence of His gracious acceptance

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

in Christ, binde themselves to our Lord and one to another, to walk together by this assistance of His Spirit, in all such wayes of holy worship in Him, and of edification one towards another, as the Gospel of Christ requireth of every Christian Church and the members thereof".
Thus

(1) While Congregationalists do not require subscription to any man-made creedal statements, they have never differed from other Christian communions in respect of the great doctrines of the Christian faith and have always claimed their place in the witness of the evangelical reformed Churches. At the same time they have stood, and still stand, for religious liberty under the Gospel and in obedience to the Gospel.

(2) The distinctive element in the Congregational polity has been the local church, in which each member has his spiritual responsibility. The purpose of church polity is that Christ, and Christ alone, may rule in his Church. We believe that the instrument whereby Christ rules in the local church is the church meeting at which all the covenant members of the church seek together by prayer and discussion to discover the will of Christ and are guided into a common mind by the Holy Spirit.

(3) Local Congregational Churches have united with other Congregational churches and with other communions for the purpose of wider fellowship and wider service. These wider unions are extensions of the principle of church government and church authority exemplified in the church meeting. It is Christ who rules in His church; therefore to no individuals or courts is given coercive authority in the Church. Where Congregational churches have entered into union with other churches, it has been upon the principle that wider synods and courts of the church should have the same sort of authority as the church meeting; that is, that they should seek to find the will of Christ for His church by prayer and discussion, and being led to a common mind should have the spiritual authority of the church meeting. It is our fundamental principle that in all the organisation of the church at every level, all authority is spiritual or, as our fathers put it, ministerial, not legalistic, coercive and magisterial. We believe this to be the true principle of government and authority in the whole church catholic; this we regard as our essential contribution to the universal church. We point out that this is a principle of unity and fellowship in the Spirit, not a principle of individualism, will-worship, sectarianism or anarchy. It is the principle of unity, of authority and of obedience to Christ.

(4) Arising from this principle is the place ascribed to the laity in Congregational churches. The church is to be ruled by the Word of God; ministers are the accredited and ordained expositors of the Word, and we have always insisted, where possible, upon a learned ministry. But the ultimate human authority in the church is the whole fellowship wherein every member is to exercise his spiritual gifts and all are to learn from each. While the minister is appointed normally to preach and administer the sacraments, any member of the fellowship may preach or administer the sacraments if called upon by the church to do so.

(5) There has been historically, and there is in principle, a close connection between our polity and political institutions. Those who have known freedom and responsibility in the church meeting have not been tolerant of tyranny in the State. Democracy, as we under-

stand it and desire to see it established, is government by discussion and consent. Our churchmanship is inconsistent not only with any form of State totalitarianism but also with government by the mass-man or the mere power of majorities. The rights of man as the child of God and the rights of minorities must be respected. We stand for political government by the discussion of free men and by fundamental consent. Because of this respect for the individual, which we learn from Christ and practise in our church meeting, we stand for political and religious freedom, for economic justice, for racial equality, and for equality of the sexes. But we stand not less for the responsibility of every individual for the good of any fellowship of which he is a member. No one can take his rightful place in Church or State apart from the education and economic status which allow the development of full personality. Our concern for social righteousness therefore springs from our churchmanship and is integral to it.

In sum—

First: A Congregational church is a covenant fellowship, binding the members to God and to one another through Christ, the Head of the Church—a fellowship in faith, in worship, in mutual service and in the service of mankind. Its duty to the world is to spread the Gospel and to work for such political and economic conditions as are implied in the Gospel.

Second: The principle of spiritual authority exemplified in church meeting where the whole fellowship is brought to a common mind by the Holy Spirit is of universal application. Congregational churches have gone into unions with one another and with other churches on the basis that Christ rules in His church only by the Spirit, and that He has not delegated coercive authority to individual officers or synods. We believe this to be the one principle of unity and authority for the universal church. This principle is applicable not less in the political life of the world involving government by persuasion, by discussion and by consent. Thus Christ rules in His church and thus He must rule also in the world.

* * *

THERE is a story told of Dr. Selbie returning from his first visit to the United States, where he had been entertained with a lavish hospitality, very gratifying, if slightly bewildering, to a somewhat austere prophet. On the eastbound voyage he spoke of his appreciation and interest to two American fellow travellers. "Yes", he concluded, "a great country, a very great country. What a pity it is so far away". The Americans looked at him in silence, till one of them said, very gently, "Far away from where, Doctor?" Before World War II New York was three thousand miles from London. Now London is three thousand miles from New York. America has succeeded to the world mission of the British Empire, which is temporarily, and honourably, exhausted. There is no shame in accepting Marshall Aid. We had spent the accumulated treasure of more than a century in a struggle for freedom not only for ourselves. We did not win alone, but the war would have been lost without us. And now if it is true we cannot recover without American help, it is also true that America can no longer live in isolation. It becomes

necessary for us to know America and understand her people and her policies.

* * *

An important book that brings the whole American scene before our eyes is Professor Harold Laski's *The American Democracy* (Allen & Unwin, 25s., p. 750). Though it is a long book, it is so well written and produced that it is a pleasure to read, and is a storehouse of facts and impressions to which to return again and again. (We noticed only one misprint, on p. 455.) It is, of course, controversial. It will be interesting to see what the Americans think of this portrait of themselves. It is intended to do for this generation what Bryce did for his in *The American Commonwealth,* that is, to explain America to the Americans as well as to the rest of the world. But though it is written out of a vast and intimate knowledge, extending over thirty years, of American history, literature and institutions, and is as friendly to Americans individually as they have been to him, Professor Laski differs from Bryce in being fundamentally critical of the American 'way of life'. He reviews the history, describes the institutions, criticizes the literature, and estimates the imponderables like religion and culture from the standpoint of a left-wing Socialist, whose basic beliefs are hardly distinguishable from dialectical materialism. At his most appreciative, one feels he is still prosecuting counsel. He is severely critical of industrialism, applies the touchstone of Marxianism, commends the successes of the Russian revolution, and in describing American democracy's failure to solve its minority problems, informs us that only Soviet Russia has succeeded. All this without apparently noticing, or at least acknowledging, that one of the fundamental virtues of constitutional democracy is that it offers itself for criticism, places all the facts at the disposal of the critic, disdains any censorship that matters (except, for the moment, with regard to its techniques of nuclear physics), and allows its visitors to inspect its factories, its slums and its prisons. When we know Russia as well as we know America and the British Commonwealth, we shall be better able to estimate Professor Laski's comparative judgments. During the nineteenth century when the British Navy dominated the oceans of the world, Norway built a mercantile marine second only to our own, Holland exploited an immensely rich far Eastern empire, Belgium was undisturbed in Africa. Nor does the now supreme American Navy send tremors of fear throughout the smaller nations within its reach. If that had been equally true of the German Army, or were now true of the Russian Army, we and many others would sleep more soundly. Every great civilization has its shadowed regions and even its shames, but so long as they can be investigated and discussed, the reformers may have to fight, but they can fight and hope.

* * *

The chapter on Religion in America is searching, and, so far as our

information goes, the description is accurate. It ought to be read there and here, and pondered. It is often helpful and challenging to know what we look like to those who disagree with us and even dislike us. For that is the impression Professor Laski leaves. He describes the stained-glass window from outside. If the Church devotes itself to social reform, it is tinkering with problems too big for it, and takes its colour from the world with which it is concerned. If its emphasis is on the Gospel of man's salvation, it is little more than 'pie in the sky'. He discusses the work of the Christian Church from the standpoint of one who seems to believe that if everybody were given a sufficient income, whatever that may be, 'the troubles of our proud and angry dust' would cease to be. He sees men and women only in masses and classes, and has little sense of the God who knew Moses by name. A man is not twice as happy or twice as good when his income is doubled.

* * *

NEVERTHELESS this is in many respects a fine book that should be read by everyone who wishes to know the world he is living in. It is a picture of a great nation that has grown into power and authority with such amazing speed that while it has many unsolved problems of its own, it must accept a yet undefined responsibility for the unsolved problems of the world.

* * *

ANOTHER book we have read with great interest is *Man's Quest for Significance,* by Mr. Lewis Way (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). It is a sociological study of our time and situation by a friend and disciple of Alfred Adler, whose Law of Compensation is held to explain how aggressive competition combined with mob gregariousness accounts for the violent fluctuations between anarchy and tyranny which characterize these days. Where Professor Laski looks to economic pressures to explain the forces that move the modern world, Mr. Way looks into the mind of modern man, and analyzes the causes of his unrest into three groups. First there is the degradation of the worker by an industrial system, now so technically efficient that a leisure society is possible for the first time in history, but where in fact nine-tenths of the population is engaged in producing goods that will deteriorate as quickly as possible so that more goods may be made, with the result that our lives are wasted in drudgery and the raw materials of the earth are being used up at a 'thundering rate'. Secondly there is the frustration of sex by the ironing out of sex differences for industrial convenience, with the result that marriage is reduced to 'a bed, some easy chairs and a kitchenette where tins are opened'. Thirdly there is the decline in social standards, marked by a sense of guilt that springs, not from the fear of God, but fear of what the neighbours will think. 'It is not that we are immoral', says Mr. Way, 'it is that our standards of

morality are so low'. Our problem is of "men's mediocrity and rootlessness". The remedy is for man to find himself, and since the real degeneracy is of individuals, it is with policies that will help to restore the worth and dignity of individuals that the hope of salvation lies.

Mr. Way, we think, does something less than justice to the contribution industrialism has made to human wellbeing, but he is surely right in saying that it carries within itself the seeds of its own death. Let man only find faith, and out of death will come resurrection. This book seems to us to make the right comment on Professor Laski's brilliant picture of a successful but bewildered industrial civilization, and shows where we may look for deliverance from our perplexities without surrendering the direction of our thought and life to a philosophy which is without God and therefore, in the end, without hope in the world.

* * *

MESSAGES from the Congregational Union of South Africa inform us of its resolute stand against the determined policy of "Apartheid" —discrimination against Africans and Indians—initiated by their Government. The existing representation of Africans in Parliament is to be abolished, coloured voters removed from the common electoral roll, and on the railways coloured people are to be segregated. When two orders of civilization meet and mingle, many problems arise, and the colour problem is a perpetual challenge to statesmanship and Christian wisdom. But it is a problem of the white man's making and the responsibility cannot be evaded by the attempt to construct a slave community. The resolutions of the South African Congregational Assembly rightly say that it is morally wrong and politically dangerous.

The story is told of Mrs. Naidu, the Indian poetess who became the Governor of the United Provinces, whose death is reported as we write, that when on a visit to South Africa she was impatiently asked by Dr. Malan, "Why do not your people go back to their own country?" she replied, "And why do not you Hollanders go back to yours?"

* * *

NOTHING can be said here that has not already been said about the trial, confession and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary. When two totalitarian regimes meet, the struggle for supremacy is inevitable. The protestations of the Vatican and the excommunication of those responsible for the trial would carry more weight if in Spain, South America and even Ireland, the Roman Catholic Church accorded the liberty she claims, and if the concordat with Hitler had not revealed so little concern for the lives and liberties of those who, if not Catholics, were yet the victims of savage persecution.

But the attack is not merely upon the Roman Catholic Church.

The trial of the Cardinal is an outstanding example of a campaign throughout the Communist countries of Eastern Europe against the whole Christian Church. The Churches Commission on International Affairs has published an account of an active campaign in Bulgaria, initiated in January 1948, which has so far led to the imprisonment of between 30 and 40 pastors and in the trial of 15 of these on charges of "espionage, treason, black-marketing and dealing with organs of foreign intelligence and representatives of international reaction". Secret orders "with regard to the growing strength of the Evangelical Church" were issued from Communist Central Headquarters in Sofia in January 1948, which stated:

"The growing activity of the Evangelical Church in our country lately is closely connected with the mad activity of the imperialists inciting a new war, and obstructing the progress of democracy and socialism.

"The international reaction found before in Bulgaria adequate support among the opposition, through whom it spread and organized all types of provocation and sabotage, destroying the people's faith in tomorrow. Today the opposition is thoroughly unmasked and disavowed by the people. It can no longer serve reaction and the inciters of new wars. That is why reaction searches for new support. And through the help of its agents, 'the Reverend Pastors', and the spies of the imperialists, reaction does its best to exploit the ignorance of the masses, and under the veil of various religious doctrines introduces the policies of foreign influence in our country, intending to capture the positions in Bulgaria necessary for reaction.

"If we analyse carefully the sermons of these pastors, we shall see that in spite of their outward innocence and virtue, behind their words, wrapped in mysticism and religious secrecy are hidden anti-national reactionary tendencies.

"And certainly what other meaning can their words have concerning the deceitfullness of this world, their words prophesying the terrible hardships and final punishment in store for humanity? By these words they intend to create among the Bulgarian people, unconfidence in their own strength just at a time when this confidence is most necessary in order that a new and prosperous society be built. These pastors intend to demoralise the people and to divert them from their only path to salvation, the path of democracy and socialism. We must take a definite and resolute stand concerning this question. We are not against the religious convictions of people, but when, under the veil of religion, they indulge in a policy of undermining the people's power we can no longer remain indifferent.

"It is our duty to lead a broad explanatory campaign among the people, exposing these evangelical preachers as the agents of international reaction, and accusing them publicly of working for the creation of positions necessary for reaction in Bulgaria.

"It is our obligation to go to their meetings in churches and to ask them the following questions:

"1. What is your attitude toward the building of our State and the power of the Fatherland front?

"2. If you have a positive attitude, how do you express it practically?

"3. From where do you obtain the financial backing for your church and pastor?

"4. What is your attitude toward the policy of the Anglo-Americans aiming to kindle a new war and to enslave foreign peoples?

"5. Why do you not speak out against the inciters of war?"

The Commission state further that "In June 1948 the Government addressed a circular letter of directive to all Church leaders that they should:

"1. Not criticize the Government.

"2. Support nationalism.

"3. Acknowledge and preach that the State stands above Church.

"4. Support fully all Government measures and train theological students to fulfill Government obligations.

"5. Since every Bulgarian is expected to become a member of 'the Fatherland Front', all pastors and priests—(*a*) must join; (*b*) should counteract anti-communist and anti-Russian propaganda from the pulpit and Church press; (*c*) should display portraits of Government leaders in churches; (*d*) should preach love for State leaders.

"Thereupon Communist teams visited pastors in their homes and insisted under pressure of threats, that pastors must join the Communist Party".

* * *

The Bulgarian Press attaché asserted to a Press conference in London that "It is our opinion that the dominance of the Communist party in Bulgaria is the surest safeguard of the religious freedom of Bulgarians".

* * *

As we go to press, the conviction and condemnation of the Bulgarian Protestant pastors is announced. Not only politically and economically but philosophically and religiously, our Western civilization is under attack. Our understanding of the Christian gospel has led us to certain basic principles of political and social life, which, because they are derivative, we must at all times be ready to examine afresh. This examination is always proceeding in the free debate in which no criticism is refused its right to be heard. But the fearful insistence to dominate the minds and souls of men that characterizes present-day Communism is an evil thing

and a spreading danger, against which we must oppose a still more resolute obedience to the will of God. In that obedience is our strength. It means an ever-deepening allegiance to Jesus Christ and an ever more rigorous examination of our understanding of the Gospel, its implications and applications. It means a humble and single-minded readiness to bring all our ways before the judgment seat of Christ.

> THOU SHALT LOVE THE LORD THY GOD WITH ALL THY HEART AND WITH ALL THY SOUL AND WITH ALL THY STRENGTH AND WITH ALL THY MIND; AND THY NEIGHBOUR AS THYSELF . . . . . THIS DO AND THOU SHALT LIVE.

* * *

CALLING all preachers and public speakers—here is rare Ben Jonson on Francis Bacon quoted by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith in his new book, *Makers of Modern Thought*.

"No man ever spoke more neatly, more precisely, more weightily, nor suffered less emptiness, less idleness, in what he uttered. . . . His hearers could not cough or look aside from him without loss. . . . The fear of every man that heard him was lest he should make an end".

* * *

THE Index for 1948 (Vol. XXVI) is now ready and may be obtained from The Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4 (price 6d.).

AMSTERDAM AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES[1]

By Norman Goodall.

I have been asked to speculate upon some possible consequences of Amsterdam for the great missionary societies of the West. Although the matter must be much upon our minds, it is as yet too early in our reflections upon a great event to say what these ultimate consequences will be. Of one thing I am certain. There is no immediate outcome of Amsterdam which makes less necessary or less urgent the great business which lies before the Board of the L.M.S. as it meets in another budget session. Behind all these figures and through the daily administration of Livingstone House two vital processes are going on. One is the undergirding of the life of the younger churches through that generous outpouring of men and money which—long before the World Council was thought of—made the historic missionary societies mighty instruments for "ecumenical and inter-church aid." The other—and still the most characteristic concern of these apostolic societies—is the sending forth of ambassadors of Christ into parts of the world where a World Council of Churches can as yet claim no foothold, for the simple reason that no Church exists there. Amsterdam has created no new instrument for discharging either of these tasks. It is true that in the next phase of its Reconstruction Department's work the possibility of the World Council sharing in the former of these responsibilities (undergirding the life of the younger churches with men and money) is bound to receive consideration; but there is a radical difference between anything yet contemplated along this line and that long-sustained partnership in personnel and finance which the missionary societies have built up with the younger churches. Now I fully accept the contention that—largely because of all that Amsterdam signifies—missions *are* moving into a new day and that much of our work will have to be done in new ways; but so far as the machinery for effective action is concerned we are scarcely yet even in the period of transition between old and new, and in the immediate *now* the state of the world and the condition of the younger churches demands not merely no slackening off in the characteristic contribution of the historic missionary societies to world Christianity, but its rapid increase and intensification.

[1] An address to the Board of Directors of the London Missionary Society, December, 1948.

Nevertheless I think that all of us who have lived with some closeness to this event called Amsterdam are aware of fresh factors in our thinking which, if we can understand and deal with them aright, are bound to influence missionary policy and lead to the reshaping of many plans. It is my present purpose to draw attention to two only of these factors and to begin a discussion on them rather than to dogmatize about the results of the discussion.

First, Amsterdam signifies that the initiative in the ecumenical movement, hitherto largely exercised by missions, has now been claimed by the churches. As my ground for this assertion I would remind you of what is rightly being spoken of as the new thing that happened at Amsterdam. This new thing is the creation of a permanent organization in which, on a world-wide scale, the churches of all the principal non-Roman confessions have committed themselves to one another through their most responsible and accredited representatives. This is something quite different from the outcome of any previous world Christian conference or ecumenical discussion. Its nearest historic parallel lies in the permanent organization which followed Edinburgh 1910—the Edinburgh Continuation Committee which became the International Missionary Council. This is a permanent world net-work of regional or national organizations such as the Conference of British Missionary Societies, the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the continental Missionary Councils, and the Christian Councils in the lands of the younger churches. This International Missionary Council has led to a great deal of interdenominational commitment, joint action and the pooling of resources; but in all this the competent agents have been chiefly the missionary societies. Where churches have been involved their membership in the I.M.C. has been indirect (through local Christian Councils) and at no point has the membership of the I.M.C. or its constituent branches been exclusively that of churches. This comparison between the World Council of Churches and the organization which has hitherto been responsible for the great ecumenical landmarks of Jerusalem 1928 and Tambaram 1938 only emphasizes a contrast between them. For in the World Council it is the churches, not the missions, which have come together in this permanent instrument through which the non-Roman Christianity of the world is brought to a focusing point. In the West, the home of the great, historic missionary societies, it is the churches, not the missions, which compose the new instrument; in so far as missions are related to it at all it is by an indirect relationship, either through the churches or in one of those peripheral consultative relationships which provided Amsterdam with its vast gallery of onlookers.

Of course, it has yet to be seen how seriously the membership of churches in the new organization will be taken and how effectively the new instrument will work; but all the signs are that it *is* being taken seriously, and there is every reason to conclude that in the years ahead the World Council will command—and rightly—the centre of the ecumenical stage. I am well aware that I am speaking about an event which has taken place at a point far removed—too far—from the interests and activities of the average church member, even the average minister or missionary. Christian ignorance of the ecumenical movement is still widespread and in many places invincible. (That is another story and another problem.) But despite the relatively small field of responsible attention which these events command, the ecumenical movement is not insignificant. It has profoundly influenced the work and policy of many churches and missions. At least indirectly it has affected the atmosphere of men's thinking about the Gospel, its world-wide possibilities and obligations. And the new thing is that whereas, hitherto, the missions have largely set the pace and tone of the movement and been the most notable feature within it, the initiative is now officially claimed by the churches. The spotlight in the ecumenical drama is on churches not missions.

It would, I believe, constitute a poor type of conservatism to regard this development with grudging. In a company of missionary leaders recently reference was being made to the fact that in its significance as a world gathering Amsterdam had taken the place previously occupied in men's thinking by Tambaram. Whereupon one of the company murmured "They've pinched it!" Now the murmurer was wise enough to have more to say about it than this, but I confess that then—and not for the only time—I wondered if the historic missionary societies were in danger of "pinching" in return the institutional conservatism against which most of them originally rebelled. No, what has happened in the "new thing" at Amsterdam is itself so largely the fruit of missionary fidelity that its new possibilities and implications for missions should be worked out eagerly if not uncritically.

Now for most of us in the L.M.S. this means that the Congregational Union of England and Wales (and this is true of its sister Unions) must be able more and more not only to speak as a Church with a world outlook but to act as an instrument of the world mission of the Church. Its representatives in the Assembly of the World Council, those who represent Congregationalism in the departmental activities of the Council, and most of all those who sit on the Central Committee and Executive, must be able to act instinctively as leaders in an ecumenical movement which exists to further the Church's world mission. This requires something

more than the "missionary spirit" in the individuals who serve in this way. It requires something more than a new agent such as the International Congregational Council which may demonstrate the size and nature of world-wide Congregationalism and foster an international understanding of Congregational principles. It calls for a close awareness of the whole range of facts, processes and problems which arise *as missionary work is done,* whether by independent agencies or in daily, administrative partnership with younger churches. That is to say, it requires inside knowledge of, and responsibility for, the daily business of the L.M.S. If all this slips into the background of the contribution which the representatives of the Congregational Unions make to the life of the World Council of Churches, something vital will go out of the ecumenical movement.

I wonder whether this means that we ought to look yet again at the question of the formal relationship between the L.M.S. and the Congregational Unions, pre-eminently the Union of England and Wales. I don't want a barren repetition of the hoary pros and cons of an old debate. I do want to see a fresh examination of the nature of our churchmanship as a missionary Church, and to discuss in the light of Amsterdam some of the administrative implications of our membership in a World Council with a world mission. And this may mean studying, in a new setting, the possibility of making the L.M.S. Board the Missionary Council of the Congregational Union, with its secretary holding the recognized status of a secretary of the Union. It ought not to be beyond our Christian wit and wisdom to achieve this while safeguarding that freedom and catholicity which are the proper pride and responsible legacy of the L.M.S. But whether this or better organizational devices prove right, the objective must be that of further equipping Congregationalism to sound in all its contributions to a world Church that accent of passionate (and informed) devotion to the world mission of the Church which, for us, is one of the authentic marks of our apostleship. At Amsterdam the churches claimed the initiative in the ecumenical movement. The determining principle in our post-Amsterdam policies and plans is to justify that claim and enable the churches to maintain a missionary initiative.

There is another feature of Amsterdam which needs to be much in the thought of missionary societies. It seemed to me more than ever clear during the Assembly that the world mission of the Church has to be considered henceforth in depth as well as in geographical extent. Some comments on Amsterdam have compared the Assembly unfavourably with, say, Jerusalem or Tambaram, in the matter of bringing to a focal point the great business of world evangelization. Although the presence of delegates from the

younger churches was a vivid and dramatic reminder of what the missionary movement has accomplished, it is true that these younger churches felt themselves to be overshadowed at Amsterdam by the older churches and their problems. Further, it cannot be said that Amsterdam gave compelling utterance to that new articulation of the missionary call which is needed like a trumpet note in younger as well as older churches if God's will for our time is to be accomplished. I share these criticisms of Amsterdam, yet I doubt if we have the right to make them— and I am sure that the missionary cause will be endangered by dwelling upon them—unless we recognize that in what has been called its Western emphasis Amsterdam was struggling with something that is integral to the problem of evangelism all the world over. The final report of the Assembly's Section Two on Evangelism was disappointing; but concurrently with the travail of this section there were taking place in Sections Three and Four debates of the greatest relevance to all engaged in the task of world evangelization. These sections were dealing, as you will remember, with the Disorder of Society and the International Order and the problem of man's redemption within these tragically disordered orders. Some, at least, of the younger church delegates saw the startling relevance of these discussions to their own evangelistic task and its problems. For Far Eastern delegates who have gone back to work out the meaning of their Christian obedience in face of an advancing Communism, the sharpest political preoccupations of Amsterdam were not merely Western; they were of world-wide validity, especially for those most concerned with the Church's obedience to its world mission. I believe it is important to recognize that in this ecumenical debate on what the Christian redemption of Society should mean there was a new beginning on the part of churches to come to grips with the implications of their missionary mandate. If we can follow up this beginning and do so together, drawing upon the experience and insight of younger and older churches, I believe we shall reach a point where, so to speak, the travail of Amsterdam's Section Two and the unanswered questions of its Sections Three and Four will issue in a new understanding of a world-wide Gospel relevant in depth as well as in extent to the total disorders of our time.

There is one consequence of this attitude which has an immediate bearing upon the task of recruiting candidates for the missionary societies today. As we speak to a younger generation which, largely because of its preoccupation with the disorder of western Society, seems less heedful of the call to overseas service than was its predecessor, we shall be able to say to it: "Your instinct is right. You are reading the signs of the times. You see in what issues

the agelong conflict between good and evil is today finding its most characteristic expression. But don't overlook the fact that what you are properly concerned about in the West may prove to be something of a rearguard action. The front line in this conflict is now in the far east. Tomorrow it will be in Africa. If you are young enough and fit enough and really mean business about this concern of yours with the fundamental problems of society today, consider afresh whether God isn't demanding your services alongside that brave but tiny Christian community which, in China, Burma, Malaya, Africa, is exposed in daily, personal terms to frontal attack in the great conflicts of our time."

And as for those who, having faced this challenge, know that their call is still to service in the needy West, less than ever can we distinguish the essential nature of their Christian task from that with which the historic missionary societies are concerned. More than ever is it necessary that, as between the L.M.S. and the Congregational Union, the British Council of Churches and the Conference of British Missionary Societies, the I.M.C. and the World Council of Churches, there shall be a common acceptance of a common calling. Only out of such united endeavour can we hope to make articulate, in contemporary accents, that missionary obligation which will drive men out of their defences, their fears and such securities as remain to them, in sacrificial but joyous obedience to a command as wide as the world and as deep as every human relationship.

ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA

(ACTS IV. 31—V. 11)[1]

By H. CUNLIFFE-JONES, B.D., B.Litt.

THERE have been many occasions in our history when authority in Church and State and family life has become tyrannical and cramping and when the honourable attitude towards such authority was to rebel against it in order to find freedom. This is a perennial problem when authority oversteps its legitimate bounds. There is a picture by Leonardo da Vinci portraying Christ as Judge of all men. The face, as the painter depicts it, is that of a sadist—cruel and delighting in cruelty. And many have been horrified at the artist's conception. But the intention of the artist has been not to paint Christ as He really is—but as He appears to those who resent and rebel against His authority. The authority—even of Christ—to those who resent it, appears tyrannical and a cramping bondage.

But we must be quite clear that this is only the negative attitude to authority, and that we must desire a positive one. Man cannot be his own authority. He could only be that if he were his own God, and that way lies madness or degradation. So to be under an authority which gives us scope and opportunity for the fulfilment of all our powers in a loyalty which we gladly accept, is joy and freedom. To be under the wrong authority, or under authority wrongly used, is a burden. But to be under the right authority, rightly used, is the condition of our best service and resulting happiness. I have been reading recently two books by great men of action, "Crusade in Europe" by General Eisenhower, and "The Gathering Storm" by Winston Churchill. In the lives of both men the acceptance of authority was the gateway to a new freedom of creative energy. Without that authority they would not have been able to do the mighty things they did. You may say that authority was given into their hands, which is true. At the same time there was an authority over them, the weight of which would have crushed lesser men who couldn't have met its demands. But for them the acceptance of authority meant freedom. The authority of God is like that. There are those who resent it, and find it tyrannous. But for those who can accept it rightly, it is the gateway to freedom and creative activity. And there are millions in the world today who are frustrated because they do not know how rightly to accept the authority of God. If

[1] A sermon preached in Mansfield College Chapel on Sunday, 23rd January, 1949.

they could be brought to accept it, they would find the peace and joy and power they are seeking.

And what of the authority of the Bible? We have learnt to reject a wrong and tyrannous view of the authority of the Bible, but we have not yet moved forward to a new positive view of its authority. With the rise of historical criticism, the main question was "can we read the Bible as a series of historical documents and penetrate to the historic meaning of the words when first they were written"? But we are coming to see that there is a further question which is even more important. It is this. "Can we use this series of historical documents which we call the Bible with confidence and satisfaction to awaken and sustain faith in the living God who is dealing with us in this present time?" That is the crucial question. What we have in the Biblical record is what claims to be evidence of the Word of God, and we have to think about its meaning and decide to what extent and in what sense any passage is speaking the Word of God to us today.

What, then, are we to make of this story of Ananias and Sapphira? It is a passage which preachers do not often choose, because they are uncomfortable with it, and they think their congregations would be uncomfortable. We are uncomfortable because the story has a harshness which we rather resent, and because it does not fit in with our experience. We must, however, be on our guard against these two reasons lest they blind us to what might transform our experience for our good.

Let us first look at the story and see the utmost that can be said positively about it, before we grapple with the difficulties that remain.

To begin with, this story is simply one of the dynamic happenings of which the New Testament is full. The story of the New Testament is the story of authority revealed through acts of power. In the ministry of Jesus and the witness of His Church something manifestly was happening of which people were bound to take notice. Not all the acts of power are of one kind, though this is not the only passage which strikes us as bizarre and makes us ask whether such things can and ought to happen among us (cf. I Cor. 5^{3-5} 11^{29}). But the story of Ananias and Sapphira is the story of something happening in the Church.

Again, we cannot fail to notice the contrast between the fact that all the disciples were "filled with the Holy Ghost" and that Peter asks Ananias "Why hath Satan filled thine heart"? The Church is the new community of the Holy Spirit in which the will of God is gladly and fully obeyed. In this community there comes the rift in the lute, and two of those supposed to be filled with the Holy Spirit are in fact filled with the spirit of the enemy.

There is a conflict between light and darkness, and the empirical Church, even though Christ has won the victory, is not free from this problem. Indeed, the question how the Church, as the community of faith, can deal with the reality of unbelief in its own life is crucial for its existence.

Again, we must be impressed by the fact that the judgment of God upon sin is real and is accepted as such. We may, of course, be horrified that the judgment of God upon sin has such drastic consequences. But we must not overlook the complete unanimity of conviction between Peter and Ananias and Sapphira that to lie to the Holy Ghost is evil and ought not to be tolerated. Perhaps we may think that because of the emotion-charged atmosphere of the early Church, or the particular emotional constitution of these two, the acceptance of the judgment had this particular effect. But the condemnation of the lie in the soul is important, and to be heeded.

Again, great fear came on all them that heard these things. We may think that, if the incident happened as recorded, the fear that it caused would be superstitious, servile fear, that has torment. It would be like the fear that I remember from my boyhood sweeping the city of Sydney when there had been an accident in Sydney Harbour involving great loss of life—and next Sunday the Churches were full. I do not wish to deny this, but only to assert that some fear of God, some awareness with a shock of astonishment that God is real and active, is inevitable if we are to take Him seriously at all. The fear of God must deepen into the love of God—but the initial recognition of God is one of fear: and living, as we do, in the midst of a population which is largely indifferent to God, we ought to admit that we should welcome a widespread fear of God which at least recognized His presence, and opened the door for the recognition of His love.

We must, however, go on to ask: in what sense is this story a model for us? And at the outset we must face the possibility that if only we had more faith and courage we should attempt to do what Peter did, and root out sin neck and crop from the life of the Church of Christ. We must face this, because we do hide from God. We do use our own pride, and laziness and self-indulgence as means of hiding from ourselves the manifest will of God. That is true not only of the past but of the present. If we decide, as I think we must decide, that we cannot accept the story in that sense, then we must have reasons for so doing to justify our contention that it is not lack of faith and courage that dictates our attitude. And there are two reasons. The first is that this story does not manifest the characteristic message of the Gospel which the New Testament proclaims. The New Testament is

undoubtedly concerned with judgment upon sin, but it looks beyond it to reconciliation with God. The message of God's grace in Christ Jesus is only imperfectly conveyed by this story, and we must see it in its Gospel perspective. Power is undoubtedly manifested, but this manifestation is a very imperfect testimony to the nature of the authority of God. A second reason follows from this: this story does not exhibit the characteristic experience of the New Testament in response to the Gospel. If the New Testament were full of stories such as Ananias and Sapphira, or if this one story revealed itself as a norm to which other incidents pointed, we should have to acknowledge its authority as a standard. But in fact, we can say that the New Testament reveals a richer understanding of God's dealing with the sinner than this story alone.

We must also take account of the fact, here as well as elsewhere in the Bible, that the actual incident was in fact much less clear-cut than it is reported to be. One of the verses which most troubles us is that which suggests that the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira —and particularly the death of Sapphira—were a judicial punishment consciously inflicted by Peter upon this pair. So it may have appeared to the writer of the story, and even the tradition as it came to him: but we are not compelled to this conclusion. In so far as the incident happened as reported, it may have been as big a shock to Peter as to anyone else. What we cannot doubt is that something of this kind did happen, and it was with a terrific shock that the presence of evil was discovered. This story in fact corresponds to Pentecost as regards the new creation in Christ, as the story of the Fall corresponds to the story of Creation.

What, then, are we to make of this story? Let me call attention, first, to the question of the relationship between power and authority which it forces upon us. The incident is a manifestation of that religious power which is generated by Christ, but in it the power is not wholly taken up into the authority of the living God so that the power testifies clearly and unmistakably to that authority. The wonder is, of course, not that such incidents should have occurred, but that there are not more of them. There is in the New Testament a growth in understanding how the power that works in the Church should truly manifest the love of God. The marvel is not that there are incidents which do not wholly manifest the true character of God in its fullness, but that there are so few of them.

This drives us to relate the story to our own experience of life, where we find a tendency for power and authority to be separated. Because of the urgent need for effective action, and the disastrous consequences of being powerless or unwilling to bring effective action to bear at the right time, we think of ourselves as realists.

We tend to glorify action for its own sake. We regard the appeal to power as the one which, whatever our hopes and ideals, is the only one which can be effective. But this is wrong. Even in this world as it exists now, power is quite ineffective unless it is taken up in the service of an authority in which men believe. In the long run—in the not so very long run—it soon betrays its own weakness. The worship of power for its own sake is an old delusion which should not deceive us.

If we turn away from this, we often turn to authority without power. Let us be right though the heavens fall. Yes indeed, but it is not sufficient to be right without the least capacity to win others to be interested in and to desire our rightness. A formal authority which is absolutely right but quite impotent to influence the contending forces in the hearts of men is a pathetic spectacle in the modern world.

What we need in public life, and also without a shadow of doubt in the Church, is a manifestation of power that shall clearly exhibit by its nature that it is under the authority of the living God. We Christians must be careful here not to confuse the power we are desiring with political power. The power manifested in the New Testament is quite insignificant in relation to the political tasks of the Roman Empire. And power manifested in and through the Church today would not necessarily mean the conversion of large sections of the population. But it would clearly exhibit its character to friend and foe alike as power.

What we have to recognize is that in life, power and authority tend to be separated, and that we must bear with the situations thus created, and try to bring power and authority together. We get our perspective for doing this by fixing our gaze steadily on the Cross of Christ, where we see power—the most dynamic religious power the world has ever seen—and authority—the authority of the redeeming love of God—united. It is from the unity of power and authority in the Cross of Christ that we can learn to deal with the separation of power and authority in the Bible, and also in life.

The story of Ananias and Sapphira also forces upon us the fact that we live under the mercy and judgment of God. This story deals mainly with the judgment of God, and we must think about that more closely. We are appalled at the treatment given to Ananias and Sapphira—at the fact that one act of dishonesty is punished by death. It would be terrible if this happened among us. And yet, can we be so sure? At least, we must realize that we do not escape the judgment of God. It may be, that not being detected, we become hardened and sink farther into our sin, whereas, if it had been detected and brought to the light, we might

have been delivered from it. Are we the better off if sin works like a deep-seated cancer, festering unseen, until when we cannot escape its reality, it is too late to do very much about it? It is one thing to know that God is patient and allows us to sin again and again against His love, that He does not bring us to death just because we have turned and cursed Him: it is quite another to imagine that we can lie to the Holy Ghost and escape the consequences.

But it is important to emphasize, as it is not brought out by this story taken by itself, that in the Gospel judgment is for the sake of mercy. It is not the death of a sinner that God wants, but rather that he should turn from his wickedness and live. The emphasis in the Gospel is primarily not even upon the death to sin, but upon the urgency, the power, the joy, and the love of being alive to God. And we may regret that the story did not turn out differently. If we had had an Ananias and Sapphira repentant of their sin, received by the little community in faith and trust that Christ would give them the power of new life, and thereby enabled to witness with altogether different power to the grace of Christ, it might have meant so much to the Church of Christ, and saved us needless mistakes as to the temper of church discipline. For it is by the mercy of God that we live, and we must acknowledge the judgment of God if we would enter into His mercy.

There is, I understand, a play running in London, in which a man has a familiar, a rabbit, which he sees, and which his sister partly sees, but which no one else sees. Christians who live in the strength of their faith in the invisible God, appear to many to be in the same position, and we must not run away from this reproach, but admit the fact that we see what others do not. We are concerned to accept the judgment of God, which other people, to our astonishment, do not seem to notice, or if they notice it, apparently have no fear, as we have, of disregarding it. We accept, if you like, inhibitions from doing certain things because they are incompatible with the authority of God, and impulses to do certain other things because our acceptance of a covenantal relation with Christ pushes us in that direction. And because we accept the judgment of God, we accept also the mercies of God, which, again to our astonishment, other people cannot see, but which are the very life-blood of the continued vitality of our faith and hope. Out of our faith in Christ crucified and risen we are continually sustained by the mercies of God in daily life, by His taking of our imperfect offering and multiplying its power, by opening doors which would otherwise be shut, by sustaining us in tribulation, in uncertainty, in fear, and in weakness.

SOME RECENT TRENDS IN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

By A. J. B. Higgins, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

The application to the Bible of the same critical methods which are used in the study of other literature has caused an upheaval comparable to that of the Reformation. The greater part of this article is intended to show that this application is being justified by its results. A valid and lasting interpretation of the Bible cannot ignore the results of modern scholarship, but must be founded upon them. Analysis must still continue, but it has now yielded such rich results that a synthesis is becoming possible, or, in other words, we now know so much more clearly the meaning of the Biblical writings in their original times and settings, that we are in a much better position to apply them to our own situation and needs. In the latter part of the article I review in brief the present position in two particularly important branches of New Testament study—the Aramaic background of the Gospels, and the Fourth Gospel.

The Unity of the Bible.

The first notable trend is the growing appreciation of the Bible as a unity. This is seen even in the historical approach. Prof. W. F. Albright writes about "Monotheism and the Historical Process" in a book entitled *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1946), in which he traces the development of the idea of God from remote antiquity to Christianity. Christianity is linked with the Stone Age in a process of historical development of thought and religion. The writer is not content to start with the Old Testament, but goes back to the ancient Near East as the background of Hebrew religion which in its turn gave birth to Christianity. Another important book published in the same year, Prof. J. Finegan's *Light from the Ancient Past,* has as its sub-title "The Archæological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion." Starting about 5,000 B.C., the story is carried down from Mesopotamian beginnings, through the history of Egypt, ancient and Hebrew Palestine, and the empires of Assyria, Chaldaea, and Persia, to Palestine in the days of Jesus, and the sites mentioned in the accounts of Paul's tours, and beyond to the famous churches of the period down to A.D. 500. In this extensive archaeological and historical study "the Hebrew-Christian religion," not the Hebrew and Christian religions, is the subject. The expression is theologically apposite, but it is historically right as well. It is a plain fact of history,

and not an unwarranted assumption of theologians, that there is, in a very real sense, a continuity between the religion of the Old Testament and that of the New. Schultz, in the sub-title of his *Old Testament Theology,* calls his subject "The Religion of Revelation in its pre-Christian Stage of Development."

The mention of two notable books from one and the same writer will serve as a point of transition from the historical to the theological study of the Bible. Prof. Millar Burrows is primarily a Biblical theologian, and occupies the chair of Biblical Theology at Yale University. In 1941 appeared his work *What Mean These Stones?* The sub-title is "The Significance of Archæology for Biblical Studies." It is significant that this book, which has a definite religious interest, was published by the American Schools of Oriental Research, and was written by the President of the Schools, who has also been Director of the School in Jerusalem. Both Testaments receive attention. Archaeology, Dr. Burrows admits, can tell us nothing of the nature of God, but it does show that "the spiritual message of the Bible is conveyed in the vessels of ancient Oriental thought and life, and to understand the essential ideas we must understand that thought and that life. Even the burning of cities and the building of walls are parts of the story in which is embodied the prophetic conception of life's meaning. Archæology helps to tie exegesis down to historical fact. Christianity is a historical religion, based on the events, experiences, and ideas recorded in the Bible . . . Archæology makes the Bible an ancient Oriental book, and in so doing may seem to remove it from modern life and present needs, but at least it compels us to ask what the Bible really says and really means. It will not allow us to disguise Moses or Isaiah or Paul" (and, we might add, Jesus) "in modern clothing" (pp. 290f.). The point is that the Bible can only be translated into terms of modern thought if its original meaning is understood, and it is archaeology, along with the historical and critical study of the documents, which provides the understanding. In 1946 Prof. Burrows published his admirable *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. He adopts the historical approach, as one might expect from what has just been said of his earlier book; but, so far from confining himself to a mere account of the history of Biblical religion, he plays the proper rôle of the Biblical theologian in seeking to bring out the relevance of this religion for us. He has a practical purpose in view, the need of the minister to preach a theology emancipated from the outmoded proof-text method, and firmly rooted in the actual religious beliefs of the Bible in their stages of development, as these have been made more plain by modern scholarship.

The unity of the Bible has recently been emphasized by Prof.

H. H. Rowley. *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament* (1945) has in view the religious value of the Hebrew scriptures, enhanced, as he shows, by archaeological discoveries and critical scholarship. The Old Testament has been truly "rediscovered," new vistas of understanding have been revealed to us by the enrichment of our knowledge, during the last century and a half, of its religious and cultural background. On this foundation rests the rediscovery of the Old Testament as a religious book. It is as a Christian book, and as an integral part of the Bible, that the Old Testament is valuable. The New Testament is the climax of the whole, and is only understood in the light of the Old. But Prof. Rowley goes on to say what is not so often said, that the Old Testament itself is not fully understood apart from the New. The New Testament "gathers up the Old Testament into the unity of the Christian Bible, but to illumine the Old with its own light. For the New Testament must be finally normative for the Christian understanding of the Old" (p. 11). "Old and New Testaments are alike parts of a single whole, as the several acts of a drama belong together. Without the final act it is incomplete, a process that fails to reach its goal; yet the final act by itself alone is robbed of its full meaning for lack of those that should precede it" (p. 10). "The Fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New" (the subject of Prof. Rowley's closing chapter) is shown by Prof. R. V. G. Tasker in *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (1946), in which the unity of the Bible is illustrated from the use made of the Old Testament in the different books of the New, while Prof. N. H. Snaith concludes his study of *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (1944) with a chapter on these ideas as they appear in the New Testament. In 1947 there was issued a third edition of that fascinating book, *The Riddle of the New Testament,* by the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and N. Davey, which first appeared in 1931. Here are discussed the place and significance of the Hebrew scriptures in their New Testament use; and Jesus' own life, as the conscious working out of the obedience demanded and foretold in the Old Testament, is depicted as the ultimate source of this use. Fr. A. G. Hebert's *The Throne of David* (1941) has as its subject the fulfilment of the Old Testament in Jesus and the Church. It is the Messianic hope which gives the Bible its unity. Prof. H. F. D. Sparks in *The Old Testament in the Christian Church* (1944) discusses the effects of modern studies and discoveries on the traditional view of the Old Testament, which yet remains as indispensable to the Church as it has ever been. In Prof. G. E. Phillips' *The Old Testament in the World Church* (1942) the Old Testament is seen against the wider background of missionary work in Africa, India, and China, and some light on the problem

is sought from a consideration of "The Old Testament in the History of the Church," a section of the book of considerable value in itself. A much slighter volume is *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (English edition, 1946), by Prof. G. E. Wright (of McCormick Theological Seminary), which is an eloquent plea for a return to a truly Biblical religion and for the treatment of the Bible as a unity, and a spirited protest, as necessary here as it appears to be in America, against neglect of the Old Testament in the Church's preaching. Though confessedly incomplete, this little book is a not inconsiderable contribution to Biblical theology. A much larger book is Fr. Hebert's *The Authority of the Old Testament* (1947). The writer finds a resolution of the conflict between the fundamentalist view of the Bible as infallible at every point and the view, arising from modern critical study, that it is a human, fallible book, by regarding it as the "Book of the Divine Kingdom," beginning with Abraham and ending with the genesis of the Church. As the Israel of God "the Church . . . is not 1,900 but 3,400 years old." The Bible possesses divine authority, not, as in the old view, because it is inerrant, but because it is the record of God's revelation in the history of the Kingdom and in the fulfilment of His purpose in Christ; but a record rendered imperfect by the weaknesses of the human understanding of the revelation. This is a splendid book, but there are signs of the danger of obscuring the very real differences between the Testaments. If there is a vital and close continuity, there is also discontinuity. Moreover, while in the New Testament there is vastly more of immediate spiritual value to the Christian than in the Old, the Old not only contains much that is of intrinsic worth in itself, but much that is not duplicated in the New.

It remains to ask one question. The Old Testament is coming back into its own as a part of Christian scripture. But what are its limits? The question is sometimes raised whether there ought not to be minor alterations in the canon of both Testaments. Why should the Book of Esther be included in the Bible, and the Wisdom of Solomon be excluded? Which collection of Old Testament books is the right one, the Roman Catholic, which includes the Apocrypha, or the Reformed? For "the unity of the Bible" is a meaningless phrase unless we are as sure of the proper limits of the Old Testament as of those of the New. In the early Church there were always two opposing tendencies, to follow strictly in theory the orthodox Jewish canon fixed at the end of the first century, which admitted only books in Hebrew (or Aramaic) written before the end of the Persian period, and to continue reading in practice other books, written in Greek, or translated into Greek from Hebrew or Aramaic, which Church tradition had

inherited from the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt. At the time of the Reformation the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformers broadly agreed with the ruling of Jerome and Augustine. Thus Cardinal Ximenes, in his Complutensian Polyglot (A.D. 1514-1517), stated that extra-canonical books had value only for edification. The same principle is upheld in Article vi of the Church of England. "And the other books (*as Jerome says*) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." The Westminster Confession of Faith went further. "The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings." In the meantime, at the Council of Trent (A.D. 1546) the Roman Catholic Church sharply defined its own position in opposition to the Protestant view, and pronounced anathema on any who did not accept the books known to the Reformers as Apocrypha "as sacred and canonical." Before this the use of books outside the Jewish canon had not been declared absolutely obligatory, nor had their authority been so uncompromisingly stated to be on a par with that of the books within the Jewish canon. On the whole the Protestant practice is justified by the consideration that, while the New Testament occasionally seems indebted to Apocryphal books, and even to others (*1 Enoch* is quoted in *Jude*), it is our Old Testament which it overwhelmingly uses and quotes. Far more important than the question of enlarging the Old Testament is the need of restoring it to its rightful place in our services. In many places it is heard almost as seldom as the three Apocryphal books which find an insignificant place in the Lectionary of the Church of England, which in actual practice does little more than pay lip service to its claim to read "the other books" even "for example of life and instruction of manners."

The renewed emphasis on the unity of the Bible is leading some back to the old mystical or allegorical method of interpretation. A healthy corrective to such archaism is to be found in the essays contributed to the volume *The Interpretation of the Bible,* edited by C. W. Dugmore (1944), by Prof. T. W. Manson on "The Failure of Liberalism to interpret the Bible as the Word of God" and by Dr. J. Lowe on "The Recovery of the Theological Interpretation of the Bible."

The Unity of the Old Testament.

It is not possible to see in the Old Testament a unity comparable to that of the New, partly because the time separating the oldest from the latest parts of the former runs into centuries, while the

whole of the latter was composed during a period of no more than a few generations, and partly because the Christian message or *kerygma* of salvation through Jesus Christ pervades all the New Testament writings as a controlling motive to a far greater degree than anything which is to be found in the Old. At the same time, there is a unity of outlook and faith in the Old Testament also which transcends its diversities. Prof. Rowley has recently called attention to this[1]. The usual view has been that the prophets opposed sacrifice, and advocated a more spiritual, non-sacrificial religion, while those who made the Law were reactionaries who defeated the prophetic teaching, and externalized religion in ceremonial observances. It is generally recognized, however, that the object of the priestly religion was to actualize the teaching of the prophets. Prof. Rowley holds that it may claim more success in this purpose than is commonly conceded. With the support of a minority of scholars he rejects the view that the prophets opposed sacrifice as such, and seeks to show that there is no fatal antithesis between prophetic and priestly religion. The later prophets Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Ezekiel certainly entertained no anti-sacrificial bias. Granted that there is a marked difference of emphasis in these prophets from that of the older, pre-exilic prophets, nevertheless they were prophets. Moreover, it was the very men of the post-exilic age, the codifiers of the Law in its final form, who edited, as we now have them, the works of the older prophets themselves. They set great store by them, and they can hardly have seen any grave inconsistency between their own outlook and that of these teachers whose oracles they so revered. The code of Deuteronomy, again, was based on the teachings of the eighth-century prophets, but it cannot be maintained that it is hostile to the sacrificial system. In point of fact, Prof. Rowley maintains, the older prophets denounced sacrifice, not for itself, but because there was so often lacking in the hearts and lives of the worshippers those qualities whose absence makes sacrifice a hollow mockery—righteousness, love, and mercy. And the Law itself did not require mere sacrifices, but demanded sincere confession of sin from those who would offer a sacrifice (e.g., *Leviticus* 5^{5-6}). Referring to the undoubted stress laid by the Law on ritual and involuntary uncleanness, Prof. Rowley writes: "Its aim was not to bring moral offences down to the level of ritual offences, but to lift ritual offences to the level of moral offences." "If the pre-exilic prophets denounced the sacrifices that were not the organ of the spirit, and the Law called for sacrifices that were the organ of the spirit, there is no fundamental conflict between them, though there is a difference of emphasis."

[1] "The Unity of the Old Testament," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxix. 2, February 1946.

In the article just referred to mention is also made of recent emphasis on what has long been recognized, the association of prophets as well as of priests with the cultus of the temple, as a further indication of a more closely unified outlook on religion than is often ascribed to the Old Testament. Prof. A. R. Johnson published in 1944 a monograph on this subject, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel,* in which the prophet is shown to be the representative of the people, as well as Yahweh's spokesman who utters oracles. The prophet finally disappeared when, after the exile, he was brought into subjection to the priesthood by being reduced to a mere member of the temple choir.

The Unity of the New Testament.

I have already said that there is in the New Testament a unity of message which we do not find in the Old. This fact is obvious to everyone. Yet there are manifest differences in the manner of presentation of the same Christian message in the various New Testament writings. What we have is a unity in diversity. Prof. A. M. Hunter's popular book, *The Unity of the New Testament* (1943) shows how, though with variations of emphasis and expression, the same primitive Christian message appears again and again in the New Testament books. The Apostles' Creed, though expanded from an originally simpler form, gives some idea of its main elements. Prof. C. H. Dodd, in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936), had shown that this message (in Greek *kerygma,* "proclamation") is discoverable in the first instance in the speeches in *Acts* and in Paul's Epistles, and so is very early. Moreover, in his recent valuable commentary on the Johannine Epistles in the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (1946), he has pointed out what may not be so obvious, that even the author of the First Epistle of John has preserved the same *kerygma* pattern, "admitting reinterpretations of the faith, but keeping all such reinterpretations controlled by the central convictions of the Gospel."

Further, recent study has brought to light a common pattern also of teaching (*didaché*) in the early Church, which was addressed to those who had heard the proclamation of the *kerygma* or message of what God had done for men in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and who now needed, whether as a preparation for membership of the Church through baptism, or, if already baptized members, as confirmation of their faith, instruction in the implications and obligations of the Christian life. By this time the findings of the method of study known as Form Criticism are familiar—that behind the Gospels and their sources lie several oral forms in which the preaching and teaching were set forth, and which were designed for the varying occasions which would

naturally arise. In these forms were recounted the events which lie behind the articles of the commonly accepted outline of the message or *kerygma,* and traditional sayings of Jesus which could be used, for example, in the instruction of catechumens and in the encouragement of the faithful in times of doubt or danger. It now appears that the method of instruction itself followed clearly defined forms. This primitive formulation of Christian teaching and exhortation can be discovered in much that is shared by the Epistles. I may mention in this connection Dr. A. M. Hunter's *Paul and his Predecessors* (1940). In the same year was published a more weighty study in the same field by Bishop Carrington of Quebec, entitled *The Primitive Christian Catechism.* Here are compared in particular *Colossians, Ephesians, 1 Peter,* and *James.* The resemblances between the Epistles of Paul and other Epistles are usually explained as due to Pauline literary influence. Dr. Carrington, on the other hand, makes out a strong case for the belief that these resemblances arise rather from the fact that all are using an already existing common oral pattern of Christian instruction. The Dean of Winchester, Dr. E. G. Selwyn, in his great commentary, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (1946), builds further with brilliant erudition on these foundations. Very briefly, his conclusions are these. Accepting the traditional authorship of the Epistle, he accounts for its resemblances to the Thessalonian Epistles by assigning to Silvanus, who is mentioned as joint author of all three, a rôle greater than that of a mere amanuensis, and by suggesting that he also took a large share in the drafting of the actual material of the Epistle. Further, comparison with other Epistles, alongside sayings of Jesus in the Gospels, supplies clear indications of "the existence of four main types of material current in the Church in the middle of the first century which were familiar to St. Peter and his faithful collaborator in the composition of 1 Peter, and which we are entitled to describe as 'sources'." These four types consist of liturgical, and catechetical material, material intended for a time of persecution, and sayings of Jesus. It is the collection of sayings common to *Matthew* and *Luke,* known as Q, upon which in all probability Peter and Silvanus drew in the Epistle. The importance of these studies is that they give us some idea of how the early Church went about its task of utilizing, adapting, and applying to various circumstances, according to a generally uniform arrangement or scheme, the oral tradition which it is the achievement of Form Criticism to have revealed to lie behind the Gospels and their sources.

The Aramaic Background of the Gospels.

The attempts which have been made to recover the actual Aramaic speech of Jesus which we possess only in a Greek form

hold a peculiar fascination. One of the best known examples comes from a comparison of what are clearly two variants of a saying concerning the Pharisees' washing of food utensils. The form in *Matthew* 23^{26} is: *"Cleanse* first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also," while in *Luke* 11^{41} it is: *"Give for alms* those things which are within; and behold, all things are clean unto you." The Aramaic for "cleanse" and "give alms" is respectively *dakkau* and *zakkau,* and Wellhausen suggested that the difficult expression in *Luke* is due to a misreading of the former for the latter. Two outstanding names in this line of study have been G. Dalman and C. F. Burney. Two of the former's books, *The Words of Jesus* (1902) and *Jesus-Jeshua* (1929), were translated from the German into English. Burney postulated an Aramaic original for the whole of the Fourth Gospel[2]. In America Prof. C. C. Torrey has believed that Aramaic originals lie behind all four Gospels, and on the theory of widespread mistranslation of Aramaic in our Greek Gospels he produced a new translation (*The Four Gospels: A New Translation* (1933)), the linguistic evidence for which he presented more fully in a subsequent work, *Our Translated Gospels.* All these three scholars proceeded on the assumption that the Palestinian Aramaic of the first century spoken by Jesus was to be found in the Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch (and the Targum Jonathan to the Prophets). Recent discoveries, however, have revealed the need of a fresh approach. In 1930 Prof. Paul Kahle published fragments of an old Palestinian Pentateuch Targum from the Cairo Geniza[3], dating A.D. 700-900. They were put there in the ninth or tenth century, when the old Targum ("interpretation"), which was a translation or paraphrase of the Hebrew scriptures in the everyday tongue of the people who by now were ignorant of Hebrew, was replaced by the introduction into Palestine from Babylonia of the Targum Onkelos as the official, standard one. The purpose of this Targum was quite different from that of the one it replaced: it was to lay down for Palestine as well as for Babylonia the official interpretation of the Jewish Law. Clearly, then, its language could not have been that of Palestine in the first century; it is, in fact, an artificial Hebraized Aramaic[4]. It is in the *old* Targum that the Aramaic of the time of Jesus is to be found. One interesting example of what this may mean concerns the title Son of Man used by Jesus of Himself in the Gospels. Dalman's contention that the Aramaic for this, *bar nasha,* was a late occurrence in

2 *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922).

3 Geniza is the name given to a store room attached to a synagogue in which were deposited, to await eventual burial, manuscripts and books whose use had been given up.

4 All this is discussed by Prof. Kahle in *The Cairo Geniza* (1947).

literature, is disproved by its presence in the fragments of the recently discovered Targum, which is evidence of its currency with the meaning of "the man" in the common speech of first-century Palestine.

The important book of Dr. M. Black, of Leeds University, entitled *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (1946), shows the relevance of the new discoveries to the study of the New Testament. He finds that the conclusion of the late Prof. A. J. Wensinck of Leiden, that in *Luke* the Western text is nearer the Aramaic original than non-Western authorities, holds good for *Matthew* and *Mark* as well. Dr. Black's conclusion is that an Aramaic source or tradition lies behind the first three Gospels, and that most of the traces of Aramaic come in sayings of Jesus. The same is true of the Fourth Gospel. He also suggests that Aramaic sources may underlie the first two chapters of *Luke*, and the speeches of Peter and Stephen in *Acts*. It seems that Prof. Wensinck left behind much valuable material which is intended "to furnish an adequate basis for the study of the Aramaic spoken and written in Palestine in the time of Christ, and in so doing to provide an instrument for the further elucidation of the New Testament[5]." It is much to be hoped that in due course this material will become available for scholars, whose further researches will lead us another step forward in the understanding of the Gospels. In the meantime, in view of the fact that "the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, written in the dialect of Galilee, represent one of our most valuable sources for the language of Jesus[6]," may be mentioned the Grammar of Galilean Aramaic (in English) published in 1939 by Prof. H. Odeberg of Lund[7].

The Fourth Gospel.

The differences between the Fourth Gospel and the other Gospels are patent to any reader, and it is generally agreed that the distinguishing feature of John's Gospel is the author's reflections on and interpretations of the truths he has imbibed from his Christian discipleship. It is commonly regarded as the latest of the Gospels. Indeed, a century ago F. C. Baur and the "Tübingen school" assigned it to so late a period as the second half of the second century, while more recently the late A. Loisy dated it between A.D. 135 and 160, and judged that its circulation must have been almost entirely limited to the province of Asia. How mistaken this was is made abundantly clear from two recent discoveries. A papyrus fragment (preserved in the British Museum)

5 M. Black in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlix (July-October 1948), p. 158.

6 M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, p. 22.

7 *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba, with Grammar of Galilean Aramaic.*

of an apocryphal gospel quotes, it is generally agreed, from the Fourth Gospel. The date of this fragment is the first half of the second century. This means that the apocryphal gospel itself must have been written some time before; and the Gospel of John will be earlier still. Then there is the now famous papyrus fragment containing a few verses from *John* 18 in the John Rylands Library in Manchester. This, too, is assigned to the first part of the second century. Moreover, both these fragments were found in Egypt. For the Fourth Gospel to have come from Ephesus or Syria and to have gained currency in Egypt would have taken time, so that in all probability it was composed not later than the last decade of the first century.

Ten years ago Dr. P. Gardner-Smith, in *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels,* argued that the Fourth Gospel's points of contact with the other Gospels were due, not to knowledge of them, but to the employment of traditions common to Christianity as a whole, and that, if this is so, the Fourth Gospel may not be the fourth chronologically. Its more developed tone may be due to the environment in which it was produced, and it may be considerably earlier than is commonly maintained.

The recent revival of the question of possible sources employed by the fourth Evangelist is another indication of growing interest in this Gospel in contemporary scholarship. Prof. E. Schweizer of Mainz[8] has reached these tentative conclusions: the style of the Gospel is the same throughout, and has been imposed on his materials by the author; he probably used sources, perhaps a narrative and a sayings source; but he has so assimilated and worked over his material, giving it stylistic and linguistic unity, that the sources cannot be disentangled. Prof. R. Bultmann of Marburg, in his new commentary on the Fourth Gospel, which began to come out in parts in 1937, and was completed during the war, is much more definite. He distinguishes a source containing accounts of miracles performed by Jesus, and a sayings source, the latter being originally in Aramaic (or Syriac). Let it be said at once, however, that this sayings source is not a collection of words of Jesus, but a non-Christian Gnostic work of which the Evangelist has made use. This is a very different matter from discovering in the Fourth Gospel a source comparable to Q, the collection of sayings employed by *Matthew* and *Luke*. Dr. Bultmann's results are here as negative and as sceptical as in his work on the other Gospels; and the writer of the review[9] to which I am chiefly indebted for information about the commentary, complete copies of which are practically unobtainable, utters what

[8] *Ego Eimi* (1939).

[9] B. S. Easton in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* lxv (March 1946), pp. 73-81.

is, perhaps, the needless warning that here there is no admission of independent authentic tradition of either the deeds or the teachings of Jesus. When Dr. Bultmann's none the less highly important work has been fully assessed, it may perhaps help to pave the way to even more significant, and more positive, results. Meanwhile it will be remembered that Burney believed our Greek Gospel of John to be a rendering from an Aramaic original. While this theory has not found general acceptance among scholars, it has been pointed out that the great majority of the passages where Burney found evidences of Aramaic background belong to those which he brought forward to illustrate his thesis that much of the teaching of Jesus was delivered in Semitic poetic form[10]. Further study along these lines may produce significant results, while the rabbinical character of the discourses is another factor to be taken into account.

It seems, therefore, that the study of the Fourth Gospel is entering a new phase. "There emerges a new possibility of regarding the Fourth Gospel as an independent authority for the life of Jesus, or at least for the traditions current in the Christian Church in the second half of the first century[11]." If this Gospel is a more independent authority than has hitherto been supposed, and if, as most scholars hold, it is right about such important matters as the day of the Crucifixion and the nature of the Last Supper, the chances are that it may be right in other things also. As regards the Johannine record of sayings of Jesus, when all due allowance has been made for the admittedly considerable interpretative transformation by the Evangelist, we may find the Jesus of history speaking to us as directly and as clearly here as He does in the other three Gospels.

[10] This is demonstrated by Prof. T. W. Manson in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxx. 2 (May 1947), pp. 322f.

[11] P. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (1938), p. 96.

THE PHŒNIX LAND

By Cameron Mackay

Palestine to us is part of the Middle East. To the classical world it was the threshold of the Orient. But the older perspective of Babylonia saw it as the western land beyond whose hills the sun sank into the Hinder Sea. To the first settlers it so presented itself, and even when Moses brought Israel from Egypt he led them round about so that they saw the peaks of their goal "beyond Jordan, behind the road of the going down of the sun" (Deut. xi 30). This nomenclature of the route along Palestine's central highlands as "the Sunset Road" indicates that to the generations before Moses Canaan was the land of the dying sun, the "invincible sun," where death's door led to new life.

Both previous Biblical entrances were from the east. Genesis notes how on the eastern border Jacob, after wrestling through the night with a God-man, received the invincible name of Israel, and "the sun rose upon him as he passed over Penuel," augury of the career of the nation then christened. When Abraham around 2,000 B.C. arrived from Ur, "the Canaanite was then in the land," the nation known to Greeks and Romans as Phoenician, and the implications of that name guide to the primeval significance of Palestine.

The Phoenicians, according to classical authorities with support from the recently discovered Ras Shamra tablets, migrated around 3,000 B.C. from the Persian Gulf region and settled in the Dead Sea zone. The Jordan valley or Arabah is given in the Pentateuch as one of their habitats, and from the direction of their entrance must have been an original one, whence they spread to the coast, to Tyre and Zidon and Gebal, and eventually to Carthage and Spain. Thus this potent nation was cradled in earth's deepest depression, with Canaan's hill-country rising to the west a matter of 2,500 feet in 3 to 10 miles, the most prominent peaks, Ebal and Gerizim, being 4,000 feet above Jordan. In the Arabah darkness falls an hour before light leaves the mountains. It was a natural setting for a phoenix-faith, a faith which lifted its eyes to the hills from the valley of the shadow of death.

The phoenix, in Greek the same word as "Phoenician," was widely believed in during classical times, and even by Christian Fathers, as a unique bird, which every 500—some said 1,461—years died and was reborn from its remains. The Greeks got the tale from Egypt, whose connection with Phoenicia was close from earliest days, and it is evident that when they used *phoinix* for "Phoenician" and "phoenix" and also for "date-palm" they

related all three. Interpretation of Phoenicia as "Palm-land" has indeed been questioned since the palm is not indigenous to Palestine's hill-country; but the Canaanites of the Arabah were certainly people of the palm. In the Erythraean Sea of their origin the grave of its eponym Erythras was shown on an island mound planted with wild *phoinikes*[1], while in the hot Arabah the date-palm flourished, Jericho in the Old Testament being "the city of palm trees," and the dates of Phasaelis and Archelais esteemed by Roman connoisseurs.

The equivalent link between palm and phoenix is not apparent to those who know only the cultivated tree. But in its wild state, with green crest rising from the dead fronds enshrouding its stem, it hits the eye as a phoenix among plants, *phoenix dactylifera* in botanical nomenclature. In origin the phoenix may have been the astrological symbol for the spirit of the world tree whose fruits were the phoenix-lights of the sky, so that in Greek fable sun and moon—Apollo and Diana—were born beneath the primordial palm, and on a unique and mystic palm the phoenix was enthroned. Though the Greeks gave the palm the general sense of victory, the root idea was of the victory of life over the powers of destruction, an idea apparent in New Testament usage and still to the fore in medieval England:

Hit is a tokne that alle and some
That buth y-schryve, habbeth overcome
Alle the develes of helle[2].

In ancient Egyptian religion the palm constantly pointed to the after-life, and its funerary usage was preserved by Jews, Christians, and Moslems. Bedouin of Sinai take leave of the newly-buried with the formula, "The sidr tree is thy aunt, and the palm tree is thy mother," while amid northern pines Whittier's verse is found on tombstones,

I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.

Phoenicia claims thus to be interpreted not merely as the Palm-land but as the Phoenix-land, a veritable resurrection-land rising from the Dead Sea to the mountains where each sunset's "fresh and sanguine sacrifice" spoke of a new day. In our increase of knowledge we set little store by creation's evangel, once so momentous to a world seeking the antidote to death, but the Bible countenances that quest. "For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made" (Rom. i 20).

1 Strabo xvi, 3, 5.
2 British Museum, MS. Sloane 2478.

> The heavens declare the glory of God;
> And the firmament sheweth his handiwork.
> Day to day uttereth speech,
> And night to night sheweth knowledge . . .
> Their voice cannot be heard . . .
> (But) their words are gone out to the end of the world
> (Ps. xix).

Sun, moon, seed, deciduous tree were evidence that resurrection was the key to the cosmic mechanism. That nature-religions went far astray is no reason for ignoring the truth in them, as if nature, too, were pagan. If truth is summed up in Christianity, then it would indeed be dismaying if there had been no anticipations of it, or if such imperfect apprehensions necessarily dragged Christianity to their own level. That Egyptians found old and new cults so similar that they could without difficulty transfer their allegiance from Osiris to Jesus may be an argument that Jesus is another solar myth, but equally suggests that shadow had given place to reality; and in all nations that had looked through things made to their Maker the like transference might have been expected.

The early Church eagerly linked rebirth in creation with the truth in Christ. The dissolution of the seed is used by Paul and the Gospel of John as illustration to Greeks of the destiny of man. In the first century Clement (whose name is in the book of life) writes, "Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually proves to us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has rendered the Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits by raising him from the dead. Let us contemplate, beloved, the resurrection which is at all times taking place. Day and night declare to us a resurrection. . . . Let us behold the fruits of the earth." In the next century Minucius Felix argues, "See how all nature offers us consolatory suggestions of a future resurrection. The sun sets and rises again, the stars sink and return, flowers wither and grow again, shrubs grow green after their old age, seeds cannot spring up except they perish. So the body in its sepulchre is like trees in winter . . . and we wait for the springtime of the body." Tertullian in the third century writes similarly, calling the world "the unmistakable type of the resurrection," for "all things are preserved by perishing, all things are refashioned out of death." And in the fourth century Cyril recapitulates the case, adding, "These arguments therefore use thou against the Greeks; for with them who receive not what is written, fight thou with unwritten weapons"[3]—an admonition still apt in the days of electron and space-time continuum.

[3] 1 Cor. xv 36; Jn. xii 24; Clement, *Epistle to Corinthians*, xxiv; Minucius, *Octavius*, trans. Brodribb, p. 70; Tertullian, *Apol.* 48; Cyril, *Cat. Lectures*, xviii.

If the Fathers still wrestling with paganism could find resurrection doctrine in sunset and grain, the present Church may see it in the chorography of Canaan without overstraining its faith. Rather it may feel that here *securus judicat orbis terrarum*, that old-world apprehension of the land as a terrain engendering dream-resurrections indicates an arena prepared from the world's foundation so that in due time the victory of life might there be staged. The Phoenician faith in "dying gods," as the classical world called the deities embodying the resurgent powers of nature, is amply displayed in the impression made on the Greeks. Dead Osiris was believed by them to have been carried by the waves from the Nile to Gebal in Phoenicia, to find there the tree sepulture whence he was brought back to life[4]. Of native dying gods the most famous were the "Lord" of Gebal, Melkart of Tyre, and Eshmun of Zidon—the last two identified by the Greeks with Hercules and Aesculapius respectively, both credited with power to restore the dead: to Aesculapius, it will be remembered, Socrates before drinking the hemlock vowed a cock, herald of day. The name of Gebal's god in Grecized form, Adonis, from the Hebrew *adoni*, "my lord," is still common parlance for comeliness, though the resurgent aspect which merged him with Osiris has faded. "Thou only, dear Adonis, so men tell," the Alexandrian housewives in Theocritus's Idyll hear before hurrying home to prepare dinner, "thou only of the demigods dost visit both this world and the stream of Acheron. . . . Dear to us has thine advent been, Adonis, and dear shall it be when thou comest again."

Melkart's name has been forgotten save among scholars, yet once he challenged Olympus. "To the end of the world" the Tyrians carried his worship, and his fires—for he died in fire—introduced the Greeks to the phoenix-cult. They seem to have read his name backwards, or left-right against the Hebrew right-left, as "Heraklem," and distinguished him as Herakles of Tyre from their own Herakles of Thebes, 1,400 years younger, who inherited some of his prototype's attributes, as undergoing twelve labours, rescuing the dead, and dying on a pyre. At Gades or Cadiz, where his deathplace was ultimately fixed, the Tyrian Herakles, or in Latin form Hercules, had a famous temple, and the Pillars of Hercules were the gateway by which he "went west."

While Melkart died at the world's end, his counterparts Adonis and Osiris found graves in the Lebanon, in the land of Gebal or Byblus, and so reflect another facet of "the glory of all lands" (Ezek. xx 6, 15). Syria to the most primitive eye was divided into opposing halves at the Lebanon watershed, whence Orontes

4 Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, 15.

sets off for Antioch, while Litany, Jordan, and Barada flow southward. North was the sinister quarter, south "the right hand" of light and life, so that the life-spirit naturally succumbed where south met north on the hinder or *acharon* shore. The name of the coastal kingdom there, Gebal, i.e. "boundary," proclaims the Ecuador of the ancient earth. At the sea-roots of Mount Sannin, the watershed crest, where a shelf of rock gave passage along the coast at the Dog River, Egypt and Assyria took pride in carving their imperial attainments; while the Dog or Wolf River (Nahr el-Kelb, Lycus), with legendary canine effigy at its pass, recalls the jackal-headed Egyptian god Anubis, opener of the way from life to death. Typhon, slayer of Osiris, formerly gave his name to Orontes, whose channel was fabled to have been formed by the dragon Typhon[5]. The impulse behind the tradition of the fateful field there for the life-spirit, whether Osiris, or Adonis slain by the boar at Afka, at the source of the River Adonis on Sannin's north side, or his Babylonian equivalent and probable original, Tammuz, the "true son,"

> Whose annual wound in Lebanon allur'd
> The Syrian damsels to lament his fate
> In amorous ditties all a summer's day,
> While smooth Adonis from his native rock
> Ran purple to the sea, suppos'd with blood
> Of Thammuz yearly wounded[6],

was vigorous long into the Christian era and is not yet expended. On the actual waterparting at Baalbek the Romans in the second century A.D. celebrated the triumph of Olympus by erecting their empire's greatest temples, whose vast ruins still, in Kingslake's phrase, loom with "dim and infinite meaning"; while England, acquiescent to losing every battle but the last, maintains that her patron saint, champion of Christian Palestine, slew the dragon at Beyrouth, on the shore of St. George's Bay, so settling the age-old contest[7].

World-old, one might say, since there is respectable tradition that the Lebanon is Eden where man was first defeated by "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan," and death gripped the race.

> Lo Adam, in the feld Damassene
> With Goddes oughne fynger wrought was he[8]

was good monkish doctrine; and in ancient Abilene, north from

5 Strabo xvi, 2, 7. The modern name is el-Asi, "the Rebel." It is remarkable that the whole Orontes country, between Abilene and Antioch, is ignored in the New Testament.

6 Milton, *Paradise Lost*, i, 447ff.

7 The Lebanon watershed is also the region of Israel's ideal boundary, "the entering-in of Hamath": see *Journal of Theol. Studies*, XXXV, pp. 22ff.

8 Chaucer, *Monkes Tale*, following Boccaccio: cp. Maundrell.

Hermon, the tomb of Abel, buried by Cain beneath a wild palm, is still revered. Ezekiel writes of "all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon," "all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God" (xxxi); Amos calls the royal line of Damascus "the house of Eden" (i 5); and, while scholars are non-committal, the idea has always had popular sympathy. Sir Thomas Browne speculates whether Jordan may be *"Jaar Eden,* that is the river of Eden". Lamartine reports and accepts the local tradition, enthusing over the country round Beyrouth as *"ce séjour enchanté de nos premiers parents"*. Tennyson pictures an English cedar "sighing for Lebanon" and its

> Forefathers of the thornless garden, there
> Shadowing the snow-limb'd Eve.

Edward Thompson points out the consonance of the Genesis story with the four main streams of the Barada which water the garden of the world, Damascus: "And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became four heads[9]."

In Scripture the Lebanon, though largely included in the Davidic kingdom, is a horizon land whose inhabitants scarcely take on flesh and blood. Its cities—Berytus, Byblus, Botrys, Tripolis, Baalbek-Heliopolis, Chalcis—seem more remote from the Bible than Nineveh or On, Antioch or Athens. Israel's northern gaze was occluded by the 9,000 feet of Hermon, south bastion of the watershed and, in its Phoenician name of Sirion, or Hebrew Senir, "breastplate" of the land. "From the moment that the traveller reaches the plain of Shechem in the interior, nay, even from the depths of the Jordan-valley by the Dead Sea, the snowy heights of Hermon are visible," so that "there was never wanting to the Hebrew poetry the image of unearthly grandeur[10]." In Old Testament use Lebanon develops more of mystic than geographic connotation: "His countenance is as Lebanon," "His smell shall be as Lebanon," "The glory of Lebanon shall come to thee," "A well of living waters, and flowing streams from Lebanon." The Song of Songs has been interpreted as the turning of Israel from King Solomon to her true spouse, the "altogether lovely" Lord of life, who calls, "Come with me from Lebanon, my bride, with me from Lebanon: look from the top of Amana, from the top of Senir and Hermon" (iv 8). Certainly Israel hoped for "the dew of Hermon that cometh down on the mountains of Zion . . . life for evermore" (Ps. cxxxiii 3).

From all the tradition setting Canaan against the Adversary as the land of life, whose alternate lot each year and ultimate

[9] Browne, *Garden of Cyrus,* ch. i; Lamartine, *Voyage en Orient,* 10 novembre, 1832; Tennyson, *Maud,* i, 18, 3; Thompson, *Crusader's Coast,* pp. 85f.
[10] Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine,* ch. xii.

destiny hung on the duel in the shadowy borderland, the New Testament turns to assert that "we did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty" on Hermon's slopes above Caesarea Philippi (2 Pet. i 16). But if the Transfiguration, and the appearance to Paul near Damascus, were no cunningly devised fables, the choice of Lebanon for these world-changing manifestations was made that the Lord of the boundary, the Victor of the dragon, whose face did shine as the sun, and whose raiment was as the light, might show the day was won, and the longed-for morning dew of Hermon descend on Zion.

Israel, rising again from Hitler's fires, may reflect on the coincidence that offers to phoenix-land and phoenix-race a phoenix-Lord. From the beginning Abraham's seed was a phoenix-breed, born as life from the dead and restored from sacrificial fire as from the dead. Ezekiel, facing across the waste to the sunset hills, fastened the phoenix-symbol of the palm to land and race, placing the emblem borrowed from Tyre between the cherubim of his temple walls; and our day sees a nation which among the tribes of earth is the unique phoenix, renascent in a land in fair way to do credit to the name of the prophet's home, Tel Aviv, "Hill of Spring."

There never was a phoenix, but the world cannot do without the fabulous bird. Its lasting popularity springs from instinctive recognition that at earth's genesis presided palingenesis, and that our fresh-eyed forebears, who were so persuaded of the resurrection-structure of the cosmos that they easily took the symbol for reality, had the root of the matter in them. The myth carries such truth that one would hardly count it pagan. Christianity was loth to discredit it, finding in it a promise of resurrection and type of our Lord, nor is there real reason why it should not still be seen as adumbration of God's truth. The early Christian attitude is reflected in the Anglo-Saxon poem, *The Phoenix,* preserved in Exeter Cathedral, which enlarges on Job xxix 18, "Then I said, I shall die in my nest, and multiply my days as the phoenix," and uses the bird as symbol both of the Christian hope and of Christ. In medieval and Elizabethan literature the idea of our Lord as the true phoenix was a commonplace:

> Behold, to save me from aeternall thrall,
> My Phoenix takes his flight unto a crosse . . .
> Offering himselfe on that unhallowed tree,
> To bring my soule to sweet felicity:
> But see hearts-joy my Phoenix lives againe,
> Passing hell torment with unspoken paine[11].

[11] Rankins, *Sola Faelicitas* (1598).

The concept had its most memorable expression in Crashaw's *Hymn*:

> The phoenix builds the phoenix' nest,
> Love's architecture is his own.
> The Babe whose birth embraves this morn
> Made His own bed ere He was born.

To believe so explains the impress on ancient cults of Canaan as object-lesson in the depths and heights of the counsel of the Most High who "hath comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales." To believe so would also seem to be integral to the Old Testament hope of life-giving dew for Zion. "Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Isaiah answers, "Other lords beside thee have had dominion over us. . . . Dead, they shall not live; shades, they shall not rise. . . . Thou art glorified: thou hast enlarged all the borders of the land. . . . Thy dead shall live . . . for thy dew is dew of light, and earth shall bring shades to birth" (xxvi).

An equivalent answer is offered in the Melchizedek psalm where, since words from some ancient hymn may well be incorporated, the lines

> On the mountains of holiness, from the womb of the morning,
> Thou hast the dew of thy youth (cx 3 R.V.m.)

may be allowed to express the faith of the Canaanite worshippers of Sahar-Shalem, "Perfect Morning," as from the Arabah they watched the sun sink into Acheron via Ebal and Gerizim[12], pillars of the sunset portal. On independent evidence it has appeared that the order of Melchizedek, king of Shalem, is the order of Canaanite faith in resurrection, and that the Messiah as predicted priest of that order must be a phoenix-Lord who puts the last enemy under his feet[13]. Here he is seen also as the Sun of righteousness who finds his bride in the underworld (Ps. xix 5) and has mercy on Zion "at the dawn of morning" (Ps. xlvi 5 R.V.m.).

"The works were finished from the foundation of the world," the writer of Hebrews bears out Crashaw; and in the Eternal Now, or space-time continuum, the Author and Finisher of the phoenix-faith, the Alpha and Omega of the universe, seeks to bring out of the shadows into his rest, "Zion . . . my rest for ever" (Ps. cxxxii 13f), the people he foreknew—but never by a presumed right-of-way which tramples him underfoot.

> In his hand are the deep places of the earth;
> The heights of the mountains are his also . . .
> Today if ye will hear his voice,
> Harden not your heart (Ps. xcv; Heb. iiif).

12 Jack, *Ras Shamra Tablets*, pp. 21, 36, 42, 53: cp. Deut. xi 30 R.V.
13 *Church Quarterly Review*, CXXXVIII, pp. 175ff; *Congregational Quarterly*, XXIV, pp. 337f.

"I do not believe," a character in a recent novel is made to say, "that there is any chance for the fulfilment of Christian ethics until the Jews are all Christians. Without them Christianity is hopelessly incomplete and still, if I may so put it, competing with Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and several other religions[14]." Apart from the loss of Jewish genius and energy, the fact that the nation whence Christianity came has lived 1,900 years cheek by jowl with it without being attracted forms a heavy drag on the Church's steps, tolerable only in belief in predestined "hardening in part, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." On the times of the Gentiles one must not dogmatize—but that cuts both ways, for they may have ended, say, last week. It is at least not for us to discern times and seasons to the extent of declining attempt to convince Judaism of blindness. When phoenix-Lord can welcome phoenix-nation to his land, we may look for a phoenix-world. "What shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

[14] Compton Mackenzie, *North Wind of Love*, II, pp. 15f.

JOHN WINTHROP (1588-1649)

A GREAT PURITAN AND CONGREGATIONAL PIONEER FIRST GOVERNOR (1630) OF THE COLONY OF MASSACHUSETTS

"THE FATHER OF NEW ENGLAND"

By Henry J. Cowell

In the whole record of Congregational history no name deserves more honourable record than that of John Winthrop, who was appointed Governor of the Colony of Massachusetts early in the year 1630. Cotton Mather describes him as "the Father of New England," and every historian of New England, without exception, writes in terms of unqualified praise not only of his qualities as a statesman and administrator but as a Puritan of the highest and sincerest religious standing. One writer makes the definite statement that Winthrop's is the only name worthy to be placed side by side with that of George Washington in the whole course of American history. A statue of Winthrop stands in the Capitol at Washington, D.C. Another is in the city of Boston.

Nor is the name and fame of Winthrop accepted only by American historians. The *Cambridge Modern History* (vol. vii) says of him "Cast in the same mould and trained in the same school as John Hampden, John Winthrop represented all that was best and most attractive in Puritanism. His definiteness of mind and his constructive statesmanship were invaluable to a young Colony, while his modesty, humility, and sweetness of temper enabled him to work with men of a narrower and more austere cast of mind and to moderate what might have been evil in their influence."

Born on the 12th January, 1588, at Groton Manor, near Sudbury, Suffolk, John Winthrop was a descendant of Adam Winthrop, to whom the manor of Groton (formerly in the possession of the Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds) had been granted by Henry VIII, in 1542, upon the dissolution of the monasteries. Admitted to Trinity College, Cambridge, in December 1602, John Winthrop stayed there only for a limited period, as in April 1605, when but a little over 17 years of age, he was married to Mary Forth, daughter and heiress of John Forth, of Great Stambridge, Essex, who was nearly four years older than her young husband. In 1608 the couple went to live at the wife's former home at Stambridge. Of this marriage there were three sons and three daughters. About

this wife John wrote that she was "a right godly woman," but there are no letters of hers among the family papers to throw any light upon her personality. When she died in June 1615, John was but 28.

Within six months he married as his second wife Thomasine, daughter of William Clopton, of Castleins Manor, Groton. A year and a day after her marriage this second wife died, and her child (a daughter) died too, within a few days. Of Thomasine John records that "she was a woman wise, modest, loving, and patient of injuries. She was truly religious, and industrious therein; free from guile, and very humble-minded. She was sparing in outward show of zeal, but her constant love of good Christians and the best things did clearly show that truth and love of God did lie at the heart. Her loving and tender regard of my children was such as might well become a natural mother; as for her carriage towards myself, it was so amiable and observant as I am not able to express."

Thirdly, in April 1618, John married, at Great Maplestead, Essex, Margaret, daughter of Sir John Tyndal, with whom he lived in great happiness and contentment until June 1647. Early in 1648 came the fourth marriage, the bride this time being Martha, daughter of Captain William Rainsborough and widow of Thomas Coytmore. One child (a son) was the issue of this fourth marriage. It will be quite clear that John could not endure living without a wife. His four wives brought him sixteen children in all. [A further reference to the third and most lengthy marriage appears below.]

Winthrop was early moved quite seriously to definite religious convictions. He writes: "About 18 years of age I married into a family under the ministry of Master Ezekiel Culverwell in Essex, and by that sometimes I found the ministry of the Gospel come home to my heart with power. I began to come under strong exercises of conscience. I could no longer dally with religion."

John's piety of the self-accusing Puritanic type was remarkable, and the workings of his conscience were often curious. It was under the influence of his third wife that the tendency towards undue religious introspection was gradually subdued. While at Cambridge he had contemplated taking holy orders, but his father persuaded him from taking this course. He turned to law, and was admitted to the Inner Temple in November 1628.

After the dissolution of Parliament in 1629, he became convinced that "evil times are come when the Church must fly to the wilderness." A statement was prepared by him in July of that year setting forth "Reasons to be considered for justifying the undertakers of the suggested Plantation in New England and for encouraging such whose hearts God shall move to join with it."

This statement appears to have been shown to Sir John Eliot and other prominent Puritans. The new movement was greatly facilitated by the decision of the English promoters to convert the Massachusetts Colony into a self-governing community.

John Fiske, in his volume on *The Beginnings of New England,* writes: "On the 26th August, 1629, twelve men among the most eminent in the Puritan party held a meeting at Cambridge and resolved to lead an emigration to New England, provided a charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and the government established under it could be transferred to that country. On examination it appeared that no legal obstacle stood in the way. For Governor the choice fell upon John Winthrop, who was henceforth to occupy the foremost place among the founders of New England. Winthrop, at that time 41 years of age, was a man of remarkable strength and beauty of character, grave and modest, intelligent and scholar-like, intensely religious yet withal liberal in his opinions and charitable in disposition. When his life shall have been adequately written he will be recognized as one of the very noblest figures in American history."

In March 1630, four ships out of eleven which the emigrants had chartered were ready to sail. These four were led by the *Arbella* (formerly known as the *Eagle*), a vessel of 350 tons burden, carrying 28 guns and navigated by 50 men. Winthrop landed at Salem, but not liking this place he left for Charlestown, afterwards crossing to the other bank of the Charles river to found Boston and its famous First Church. On the roll of membership of this church his own name appeared first. By the Christmas of 1630 17 ships had sailed for New England, carrying more than 1,000 passengers.

By 1634 some twenty villages had been founded on or near the slopes of the Bay. Permanent houses and other buildings had been erected; roads made and defences put up. Trade was being carried on with the Mother Country, and in other directions also definite progress was being made.

Nine years later the plantation was divided into the four shires of Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, and Middlesex, and in the same year the four New England Colonies of Massachusetts and Plymouth, Connecticut and New Haven were confederated, with Winthrop as the first President of the Confederation.

Winthrop lived to see Boston become a thriving and prosperous capital and the State extended by successive settlements over a wide territory. In all these settlements religion had taken deep root and churches were gathered wherever there was an adequate population. Winthrop had been re-elected Governor for most of the years succeeding his first appointment in 1630. He passed away in 1649, six years after the death of William Brewster.

The men of Massachusetts laid the body of their Governor with great solemnity and honour in the burial-ground of King's Chapel in the city of Boston. There, they said, was his sepulchre, but his epitaph "was engraven in the minds of the people as a worthy gentleman who had been good to Israel, having spent not only his whole estate but his bodily strength and life in the service of his country as a living torch, spending his health and wealth for the good of others."

Winthrop was but 61 when he died; his life had been filled with hard work, much anxiety, and many sorrows. His passing naturally exerted a deep feeling of loss in other Colonies besides Massachusetts, for he had been relied upon by them for advice and counsel. In the same tomb with the Governor were afterwards successively buried his son, John Winthrop, jun., Governor of Connecticut, and the second John's two sons—Fitzjohn Winthrop (also Governor of Connecticut) and Wait Still Winthrop (chief justice of Massachusetts).

Wherever we turn in the history of New England we come across tributes to the first Governor of Massachusetts. Reginald W. Jeffery, for example, in *The History of the Thirteen Colonies of North America,* writes: "John Winthrop's character was of the best, and he is revered as one of the strongest and certainly one of the most lovable of the early settlers in America. He was a thorough Puritan. Like his brethren, he showed humility, but unlike so many he was sweet-tempered and moderate. As a man of wealth, of good birth, and of great ability, Winthrop was the most remarkable Puritan statesman in Colonial history."

Occasionally we get a quaint touch as in a letter from Thomas Wiggin, one of the Governor's companions, who discloses that "John was a discreet and sober man, wearing plain apparel, drinking water ordinarily, ruling with much mildness, and putting his hand to any ordinary labour with his servants."

MARGARET WINTHROP

John Winthrop, in his third wife, Margaret Tyndal, found a real helpmeet: she it was who made him the man he became. Nothing more was heard of his former moodiness or timidity. He learned to step out boldly among his equals and to take his share in the world's work. His married life with her lasted for almost twice as long as his total married life with the other three wives. Margaret's home in Great Maplestead, Essex, named Chelmshey House, was a fine manor house which had been built by her father, Sir John Tyndal. In her life of Margaret, Alice Morse Earle writes thus of Winthrop at the time he courted the lady who became his third wife:

> "Winthrop's flowing locks and sober beard, his thoughtful forehead and clear-cut features, combine to make a picture

which is unmistakably that of a sincere and kindly English gentleman. But though he might be deemed Elizabethan in expression and bearing we know that he was no Elizabethan in nature and temper. For he was ever orderly, never capricious; he had an intense domestic tenderness rather than the broad geniality of the Elizabethan age; he was just rather than sympathetic; he had a Christian courteousness rather than a cavalier courtliness; he was reflective and dignified but always kind. John Milton has been held by many to be the noblest type of the Puritan. I think that John Winthrop, as seen both in his public career and his domestic life, in deeds as well as words, is a far nobler personification of the essential spirit and flower of Puritanism."

Two love-letters from John Winthrop to Margaret Tyndal have been preserved. They are exceedingly long, so I take only a few sentences from the first:

"My only beloved spouse, my most sweet friend, and faithful companion of my pilgrimage, I wish thee a most plentiful increase of all true comfort in the love of Christ, with a large and prosperous addition of whatsoever happiness the sweet estate of holy wedlock, with the kindest society of a loving husband, may afford thee. Being filled with the joy of thy love, and wanting opportunity to more familiar communion with thee which my heart fervently desires, I am constrained to ease the burden of my mind by this poor help of my scribbling pen, being sufficiently assured that, although my presence is that which thou desirest, yet in the want thereof these lines shall not be unfruitful of comfort unto thee."

When Winthrop, on April 24, 1618, carried his third wife to Groton Manor, there were already in that home four young children by his first wife—John, Henry, Forth, and Mary. At the birth of her first child (Stephen), in September, 1619, Margaret came very near to death. Two years later a second son was named Adam, after his grandfather. John Winthrop, by the duties of his profession as a lawyer, was kept much in London and on the circuit. He was a J.P. when he was but 18 years of age. Frequent letters were exchanged between husband and wife. The first of these letters is described as "certainly one of the most exquisitely trustful and tender letters ever printed. Its piety and simplicity makes it seem the typical voice and expression of a pure and idyllic love".

Here is a portion of the actual letter: "My most sweet husband, How dearly welcome thy kind letter was to me I am not able to express. The sweetness of it did so refresh me. What can be more pleasing to a wife than to hear of the welfare of her best beloved, and how he is pleased with her poor endeavours? I blush to hear myself commended, but it is your love that conceives the best and

makes all things seem better than they are. I wish that I may be always pleasing to thee, and that those comforts we have in each other may be daily increased as far as they be pleasing to God. I will do any service wherein I may please my good husband. I confess I cannot do enough for thee, but thou art pleased to accept the will for the deed and rest contented. I have many reasons to make me love thee whereof I will name two: first because thou lovest God, and secondly because thou lovest me. If these two were wanting, all the rest would be eclipsed. But I must learn to discourse and go about my household affairs. I am a bad housewife to be so long from thee, but I must needs borrow a little time to talk with thee, my sweetheart. . . . Farewell, my good husband. The Lord keep thee. Your obedient wife, MARGARET WINTHROP". "I send you a turkey and some cheese. I did dine at Groton Hall yesterday. The boys are in health and remember their love. We did wish you there, but that would not bring you, and I could not be merry without thee".

That was a letter from the wife to the husband. Here is a letter from the husband to the wife: "My dear wife, Thy sweet letters (without date), how welcome they were to me I cannot express. Here where I am I have all outward content and most kind entertainment; only the want of thy presence makes me weary of all else, so dear is thy love to me. Now embracing thee in the true affection of a faithful husband, I remain, Thine, JOHN WINTHROP. I have nothing to send thee but my love, neither shall I bring thee anything but myself, which I know will be best welcome".

Winthrop's residence in London was not from choice, or love of city life, but arose out of the exigencies of his office and calling. In his letters to his wife he constantly lamented his absence from home in such tender sentences as these: "My heart is already with thee and thy little lambs, and I will hasten home with what speed I may". "My heart is at home, and specially with thee, my best beloved".

In the autumn of 1629, writing from London to his wife, John says: "I shall be as loath to leave my kind wife behind me as she will be to stay, but we must leave all in God's good providence. I am very sorry that I am forced to feed thee with letters when my presence is thy due and so much desired; but my trust is that He who hast so disposed of it will supply thee with patience and better comfort in the want of him who thou so much desirest. The Lord is able to do this, and thou mayest expect it, for He hath promised it. Seeing He calls me into His work, He will have care of thee and all ours and our affairs in my absence; therefore I must send thee to Him for all thou lackest".

As the time of departure for New England approached, John wrote: "I must begin now to prepare thee for our long parting which

grows very near. I know not how to deal with thee by arguments, for if thou wert as wise and patient as ever woman was it must needs be a great trial to thee, and the greater because I am so dear to thee. That which I must chiefly look at in thee for thy ground of contentment is thy godliness".

The first year in the new Colony was a time of apprehension and of loneliness. There are several letters. I give passages from two of these:

> "My dear wife, We are here in a paradise. Though we have no beef and mutton, yet here is fowl and fish in great plenty. I will say nothing of my love to thee and of my loving desires for thee: thou knowest my heart".
>
> "I praise God I want nothing but thee and the rest of my family. Again I kiss thee, my sweet wife, and commend thee and all ours to the Lord, and rest, Thine, JOHN WINTHROP".

At length comes the great day of the arrival of Margaret. Under date of November 2, 1631, Winthrop enters in his *Journal*: "There came in the ship *Lyon* the Governor's wife, his eldest son and his wife, and others of his children, with other families, being in all about sixty persons, who all arrived in good health. There was great store of provisions—fat hog, kid, venison, poultry, geese, partridges, etc., so as the like joy and manifestation of love had never been seen in New England. We kept a day of thanksgiving at Boston".

There were doubtless many other occasions for thanksgiving as well as for sorrow in the fifteen years Margaret was spared to enjoy with her husband after her arrival in New England. But there was more than a touch of real tragedy in the manner of her passing, which took place on June 14, 1647. In this year there ran through the country, among Indians and English, French and Dutch, what was termed an "epidemical sickness" taking the form of a cold accompanied with a light fever. To this sickness the Governor's wife fell a victim. It did its fell work quickly—all too quickly. She became ill on the afternoon of June 13, died on the following morning, and a day later was buried. In his *Journal* her husband recorded in these characteristically simple words the passing of his dear companion in grief and in joy: "In this sickness the Governor's wife, daughter of Sir John Tyndal, knight, left this world for a better, being about 56 years of age: a woman of singular virtue, modesty, and piety, and specially honoured and beloved of the country".

No portrait or description of Margaret exists, but it is known that she had "a sweet and smiling countenance", and that she was remarkable alike for mind and for character. It is further on record that she was one of the loveliest of her sex and entitled to be given

the foremost place among the Puritan women of New England. She gave to her husband six sons and two daughters.

In her biography entitled *Margaret Winthrop,* Alice Morse Earle writes: "It was given to Margaret Winthrop to endure, in her 56 years of life, a far wider and deeper range of emotions and experiences than had fallen to the lot of many women. She had a life of hard work and of many cares, and she experienced entire loss of fortune; yet I think her life was a happy one, for in all her sorrows she was cheered and strengthened not only by an inspired religious faith but by a love such as is the fortune of few women to arouse and retain: a love so tender, so thoughtful, so sterling, that it might well prove to her, as her husband said, a symbol of the everlasting love of her heavenly Father. Throughout her life she ever displayed traits of character and disposition and faith that were most noble and beautiful, and rendered her fit to stand as the emblem and personification of what we have learned to believe is one of the purest types of womanhood—the Puritan wife and mother".

We close this brief sketch of "the Father of New England" with a quotation from *The Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*:

"1630. This year it pleased God, of His rich grace, to transport over into the bay of Massachusetts divers honourable personages and many worthy Christians, whereby the Lord began in a manifest manner and way to make known the great thoughts which He had of planting the Gospel in this remote and barbarous wilderness and honouring His own way of instituted worship. Among the rest a chief one among them was that famous pattern of piety and justice Mr. John Winthrop, the first Governor of the jurisdiction. They came over with a fleet of ten ships: three of them arrived first at Salem, the other seven ships arrived at Charlestown. The four that first began that honoured church at Boston, unto whom there joined many others, were Mr. John Winthrop, Mr. Isaac Johnson, Mr. Thomas Dudley, and Mr. John Wilson. Thus out of small beginnings greater things have been produced by His hand that made all things of nothing; and as one small candle may light a thousand so the light here kindled hath shone unto many—yea, in some sort to our whole nation. Let the glorious name of Jehovah have all the praise in all ages.

According to Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, Winthrop, although a member of the Church of England in the Mother Country, soon saw clearly in New England that Congregationalism was the best and only mode of planting and propagating Christianity in that part of the country in those times, and he was henceforth a Congregationalist until his death.

CHARLES I—THE NONCONFORMIST ANSWER

By D. W. Langridge, M.A.

The tercentenary of the execution of Charles I produced a surprising, one might even say an hysterical outburst of posthumous loyalty; speeches, exhibitions, eucharists, wreaths, sermons, and even an appeal for the addition to the calendar of a day sacred to the memory of Charles King and Martyr. It was for the most part an unilateral outburst. One wonders that no eminent Free Churchman has spoken an authoritative word, as beyond doubt fifty years ago many Free Churchmen would have said many words, and strong words at that, in defence of Cromwell and the Parliamentary interest. I feel that justice demands that something at least should be urged on our side of the affair, something in honour of the Puritans. No one desires, heaven forbid, the rekindling of controversy, of which indeed we already have enough and to spare, nor do we desire the mere detraction of the King. As a private person Charles Stuart, for all we know to the contrary, may have been devout, brave and conscientious. He was put to death, however, on that winter morning in Whitehall not as a private individual but as an enemy of the people, politically untrustworthy, evasive and shifty, and as the head of an oppressive and impossible regime.

Mr. Ford, as we know, thought that history was bunk, but we may hope that there are not many among us quite as illiberal as that. The political situation in the middle of the seventeenth century was confused enough, but ideas which have flowered and parties which are flourishing today were then in germ. John Lilburne and his Levellers with their green ribbons and their *Agreement of the People* anticipated Chartism by two hundred years. Gerard Winstanley and his Diggers stood for something which has made, is making and is obviously destined to go on making, a great uproar in the modern world. During these stormy years also a lonely scholar was busy upon a work which contains in essence the philosophy of modern totalitarianism, Thomas Hobbes and his *Leviathan*. In those days the authority of Parliament was being asserted and its supremacy once and for all established, and the new and hitherto unknown conception of toleration was being canvassed, finding advocates and champions. Much that is noblest in the English genius was being distilled into the national soul during those bitter and contentious years. Especially active at the climax of the great conflict, and most directly responsible for what happened were our own spiritual ancestors, the Independents and

their 'chief of men'. The Great Rebellion, like most of the stern and memorable conflicts of history, was a struggle of good against good, of one kind of good against another kind of good. Neither side had a monopoly of right. But it is but just and fair that as this tercentenary comes and passes, the kind of good for which the Puritans fought and died should at least be remembered and honoured.

Confusedly yet vividly three vital things were at issue in that tragedy, and from the angle of these three we may briefly review it. They overlap and merge into one another, but we may perhaps distinguish them as the Economic, the Social, and the Religious.

1. Our history books tell us that approximately the poorer regions of the country, the North and the West, stood for the king, while the rising industrial towns, the navy, all the ports, and above all London itself, stood behind the Parliament. Indeed, it was probably the money-power of the city which ultimately decided the day. This allocation respectively of the forces engaged may be put in another way. The great nobles for the most part, with their relations and retainers, their staffs, servants and tenants supported the cause of the Stuarts, while the new and rising business interests, the industrialists and financiers, and all the personnel of trade and commerce were solid for the Parliament. In other words, Charles and his two masterful lieutenants, Strafford and Laud, who both also a few years earlier had shared their royal master's melancholy fate, were in arms to defend the old feudal order of society. But it was too late. That order of things was passing. It was being supplanted by the rising power of the new capitalist classes. That indeed was coming, although the Industrial Revolution was still a hundred years ahead. The Puritan triumph was the triumph of Capitalism.

Obvious and never perhaps more needed than today is the moral. It is fatal to cling to an outworn system, to galvanize a dying culture. No man is strong enough to do it, and a grim nemesis awaits those who attempt it. This trick Germany tried a few years ago and we saw what happened. She tried to put the clock back and it did not come off, as it never does nor can come off. Three hundred years is a long enough time ago for most people, but if we go back a thousand years earlier still we can see another case of the same thing. It was the period in which what a recent historian has called "the First Europe" was taking shape. The Roman Empire had hopelessly declined, crumpled and gone. New things were in the womb of time. But the men of that time were fatally hypnotized and obsessed by the majestic memory of Rome. It haunted them. It seemed eternal to them. They were unable to conceive of it as irrevocably gone and finished. Their obsession with an empire and a system already dead became their

fatal handicap. So in a measure it was with Charles and the men and classes around him. When the axe fell on that memorable 30th of January, it was as though history itself were saying, 'You can't go back, and you can't stand still. This is what happens to those who attempt it'. Feudalism was finished, had been finished for a century, and a new order had come in to take its place. Today that new order in its turn is finished and must give way before what is to follow. Is there anything more vital for the men and women of our time to understand than this?

2. It was, then, that memorable clash and tragedy, the triumph of industrialism over feudalism. But there was also something else; the new idea of liberty, of toleration, of the free and unrestrained expression of opinion, the citizen's right to individual independence. This was a new thing, and even its advocates and champions give the appearance of handling it in a gingerly manner as something new and dangerous. It was still far from being the solid, recognized and legally guaranteed right which in this country at least we take for granted today. Our respectful submission is just this, that on the whole it was the Puritan party and those who thought and fought with them who were in fact the champions of this new and progressive conception. The great Rebellion was a struggle not indeed of the English people as a whole, for then, as now, the majority were unconcerned about and indifferent to such matters, and there were at no time more than 130,000 men under arms, but of a resolute and determined minority for the establishment of civil and religious liberty.

Prynne with his pamphlets; John Hampden in his protest against the injustice of collecting ship-money from the inland towns; Eliot and Pym in Parliament; George Fox and John Bunyan with their brave witnessing and frequent incarceration; Milton in his poems and sonnets, and especially in his noble plea for the freedom of unlicensed printing, *Areopagitica*, the greatest pamphlet in our English tongue; Cromwell and his russet-coated captains with their swords—can it be denied that all these and the Pilgrim Fathers, those sturdy Independents of a generation before, who became the virtual founders of the United States, that in their various ways all these were battling and suffering in the great cause of liberty? No one claims that everything they did was right. No one claims that when they triumphed they in their turn allowed perfect freedom of conscience to everyone all in a moment. We claim only that they were the pioneers. We claim that every Englishman today in the enjoyment of his liberty owes a deep debt to these men.

And here, indeed, is the surprising thing. It is widely and frequently said in these days (whether the fear is a cunning pretence or a genuine apprehension who shall determine?) that freedom is in danger. One would have expected that those who are so

vociferously concerned about this would have seized upon this tercentenary as an opportune and splendid occasion for remembrance and rally. There has, however, been very little said about it, certainly nothing at all commensurate with the fuss which has been made on the other side. The silence of the eminent need not carry with it the churlish concurrence of the ordinary. We at least will remember these champions of freedom, honour them and stand fast in the liberty wherewith they made us free.

3. The idea of a free church—a 'gathered church', as our fathers used to call it, a church composed of men and women who felt themselves called by the Spirit, independent of all interference from the State and of the authority and coercion of the bishop—had, of course, been mooted by such pioneers as Barrow and Greenwood some fifty years earlier, and, by the cool and grudging articles of the Toleration Act, the right to form such associations was legally guaranteed and assured forty years later. But together with the other issues at which we have glanced, it was also around this question that the great struggle between the King and the Parliament, or more accurately between the King and the Army, raged. "The independents", says G. M. Trevelyan, "wanted a church made up of free, self-governing congregations, not under the scrutiny of any general organization bound to enforce orthodox opinion and practice".

When the tercentenary was actually celebrated at the end of January, Canon Smythe told us that Charles "died for the Church of England"; the Bishop of London told us that the Church of England is committed to "the veneration of the martyr"; and at St. Margaret's the service included the old Collect in which the King is described as "Saint and Martyr". All that is, perhaps, all very well in its way, but those who rebelled against the royal saint thought, and their descendants still think, and the Atlantic Charter endorses the claim and guarantees the right, that in the deepest things of the soul a man ought not to be coerced by Church or State, but should be free to worship as and how his conscience advises him. The Puritan triumph established the right, violently and brutally rescinded indeed at the Restoration, but subsequently written into the law of the land, of liberty of assembly and freedom of worship. This is the essence of Nonconformity; a liberty which we use and take for granted today. But in that distant century it was won only by much severe suffering and by much hard fighting.

Other and still more formidable menaces have risen up to threaten us in these modern times, and perhaps the great issues of three hundred years ago are dwarfed. No one desires to kindle again the fires of controversy, still less to claim that they and they alone are right in everything. We claim only that those who fought

these things out and who, in the end, felt that there was no other way than the death of the King were, in fact, men of high principle, some of them even were godly men, men who did what they did out of conscience and the fear of God. No doubt there was much that was fine, personalities who were noble, on both sides; as men like Lord Falkland and Jeremy Taylor on the Royalist side, and Bunyan and later, Baxter, on the other side clearly attest. Is it quite fair, however, that one side and one side only should be remembered and honoured? We have been concerned here to establish one modest claim and one only, that the foes of the King were as conscientious and as honourable as he, and that perhaps they effected even more to the glory of God and for the name and fame of England.

NEW EDITIONS

The Rev. L. J. Tizard's *Facing Life with Confidence* (Independent Press, 6s.), with a foreword by Dr. Maude Royden Shaw, is in its second edition. It contains eight sermons dealing with the common problems of life. They are marked by much practical wisdom and good sense, and have also the note of sympathy. Many will find help in them.

The Home University volume on *The Literature of the Old Testament,* by G. F. Moore, has appeared in a second revised edition by the Rev. L. H. Brockington, who brings up to date a most useful handbook. The price is 5s.

Prof. T. E. Jessop's *Law and Love* (Epworth Press, 6s.), first published in 1940, is "A Study of the Christian Ethic".

Miss Muriel Lester's *Ways of Praying* (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.) has reached a ninth edition.

Mr. E. E. Kellett's *Short History of Religions* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.), newly issued after 15 years, is a mass of information set out with remarkable objectivity. It should be welcome to all who do not regard objectivity in these matters as lack of faith.

The Times of Jesus Christ (F.o.R., 6d.), by the Rev. A. G. Knott, is a short study, scholarly and stimulating, of "the political and economic background of the Gospels".

In *The Little Book about David* (Lutterworth Press, 6s.) Miss Lettice Bell retells incidents in the life of David, each with a suitable text-heading and a brief, apt comment on its message.

The Way into the Kingdom (Burns, Oates, 3s.) contains articles on meditation and imagination by Miss Vera Barclay.

In *A Seventeenth Century Country Gentleman* (Cambridge: Heffer, 10s. 6d.), based on 3,552 items in the account-book of Sir Francis Throckmorton (1640-80), Mr. E. A. B. Barnard provides details of social life not easily discoverable elsewhere, with a good index (*e.g.,* camphor-balls, canary wine, candles).

Bleak House, with an introduction by Sir Osbert Sitwell, is now in the new Oxford Illustrated Dickens (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.).

EXISTENTIALISM AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

By E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., D.D.

Existentialism bids fair to become as much a fashion today as psychoanalysis was a generation ago. There is, to be sure, this important difference, that whereas the psychologists left it to others to popularize their ideas, the philosophers of the new school are their own propagandists. At least, that is the case in France, where both Sartre and Marcel, convinced that they have a message to deliver, use the novel and the drama to convey it, as well as the philosophical essay or book. In Germany, as is to be expected, existentialism has remained more severely academic. For a knowledge of the movement as a whole the English reader is unfortunately still dependent on two short and critical accounts, both translated from the Italian and both, in my judgment, seriously misleading. Ruggiero's *Existentialism* (1947) is obviously the work of one who is so eager to controvert a position that he has not taken the time to understand it first. Bobbio's *Philosophy of Decadentism* (1948) has some well-deserved criticisms of Sartre and some acute judgments on the relation of the new movement to the temper of the time. But he has sadly misrepresented Jaspers.

For the immediate origins of existentialism we go back, of course, to Kierkegaard, the solitary and neurotic genius whose volumes piled up unsold in the bookshops of Copenhagen during his lifetime, but whose ideas march amid the disillusionment of our time. It is to him that we owe the concept of existential thinking as something for ever opposed to Hegel and "the System", as he termed the Hegelian philosophy. Existential thinking is personal, concrete, and ethical. Its standpoint is that of the responsible participant and not that of the mildly-interested spectator. One thinks existentially, that is to say, when one bears in mind all the time that one is personally involved in one's thinking and that for any conclusion one reaches in thought one must be prepared to accept responsibility in actual living. The antithesis of it for Kierkegaard was speculative philosophy, but for us it is opposed rather to the impersonal procedures of natural science. "Science", said Madame Curie, "is interested in things and not in persons".

Characteristic of this pattern of thinking is the emphasis laid on freedom, the appeal to choice and decision, and the acute appreciation of man's finitude and the tragic situation in which he is involved. One theme which is central for the existentialist was hardly respectable in earlier days. It is that of death, of death as not merely the point at the end of one's line of life, but rather the shadow which

hangs over it from moment to moment. It is clear that there are affinities between existentialism and certain elements in the Christian tradition. Pascal, for example, comes to one's mind at once as a forerunner of Kierkegaard, and more than one writer has sought to bring out their agreement and difference. Again, behind both these men stands the figure of Augustine, that pioneer of the modern world as of the medieval. It is of interest in this connection to see how Augustine differs from Descartes in the use to which he puts their common contention that the doubt which calls everything else in question only serves to establish the existence of the doubter. The argument left Descartes with mind as a "thinking substance", Augustine's inference was to what we mean by personality and the total self. Luther has sometimes been added to these two names. But that Kierkegaard did not think of him in this light is very clear. His references to the reformer are usually of the uncomplimentary kind.

It will be obvious at the outset that existentialism as thus defined is in sharp contrast to certain other contemporary tendencies. Thus, it is the sworn foe of Marxist collectivism. There is nothing indeed against which it protests more vehemently than the absorption of the individual person in the mass. Nor has it any sympathy with economic or, for that matter, any other form of determinism. Never perhaps in the course of history has a philosophy stressed freedom more than existentialism does. Its dangers lie in the direction of solipsism rather, though its best representatives have taken care to guard against that possibility.

Existentialism and Logical Positivism, again, are poles apart. The latter would reduce truth to what can be verified by an appeal to experience, sometimes to sense-experience; the propositions of ethics it would dismiss as "emotive". Those who pass moral judgments are but working off their private feelings. The former is disposed to look askance at science and its impersonal standpoint. The emotions for it do not obscure truth, they reveal it. Existentialism is concerned with the whole man, with will and feeling as well as thought.

I

In what follows it is proposed to give a very brief account of four thinkers. It will be best to begin with Martin Heidegger. He tells us now that his main work, *Being and Time* (*Sein und Zeit,* 1927), has been sadly misunderstood. It was widely supposed at the time that it offered a secularized version of the Christian dogmas of the fall and original sin, while bidding man dismiss all hope of redemption except that which he himself can furnish. His latest work (*Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit,* 1947) contains his apologia. He points out that the earlier volume was only the first part of the projected whole. This first part, he now says, was destructive only

because it was intended to clear the ground for construction in the second. The argument of the new book appears to be that Plato, rather than Adam, is the source of our misfortunes! By interposing the forms of logical thought between the mind and reality, he took from us that direct acquaintance with Being which was once our possession. The mission of philosophy is to help us recover this. Be that as it may, the fact remains that it was the earlier reading of Heidegger's system which was put to theological uses.

On this view, he sets out from an analysis of life as something for which we are conscripted. Our condition is one of being "thrown down" into the world. Human life is a "being-in-the-world" and as such it is uneasy and insecure. It is characterized by "care". We are obsessed, cluttered up, and driven. We do not rule our own lives, we are ruled by the anonymous tyranny which the French call *on*. We are creatures of the mass-mind, of convention and what is "done". Hence the banality, the sheer futility of life for so many people. But there is one fact which will not allow us to succumb altogether. It is the fact of death. "One" does not die, *I* do. That I must die is the certain uncertainty which troubles the false peace of my servitude to the mass-mind. It compels me to an individual and "authentic" existence. What was mere care for the passing day becomes now a metaphysical "dread" or "anxiety" in which my whole being is implicated. Under the influence of this, I awake to the fact that I am free and therefore responsible. I have a "conscience" which bids me shape my destiny. If there are no stars in heaven and the lights of earth are quenched, I remain master of my soul and can yet win an authentic existence.

In various books, Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg, known in this country chiefly for the radical attitude he adopts on problems of Gospel criticism, has applied the categories of Heidegger's philosophy to the interpretation of Pauline Christianity. The process is a curious one, if indeed Heidegger got those categories in the first instance from Paul! Bultmann finds in his description of being-in-the-world, care, and dread a close parallel to what the *N.T.* means by the "flesh". This is the realm of impermanence and anxiety in which men spend their lives till they are claimed at last by death. Here rules "the dread which makes each man cling to himself and to his own because of the secret feeling that everything, even his own life, is slipping from him" (*Offenbarung und Heilsgeschehen*, 1941, 44). Philosophy can thus discover of itself the truth to which the *N.T.* gives expression. Where it errs is in supposing that the realization of what constitutes the human problem brings with it a solution of that problem. Here faith must enter in. Man's ultimate malady is self-will, and for such a disease he has himself no cure. His salvation must come from beyond himself, from the grace of God in Christ.

Another theologian who has conscripted Heidegger's ideas for service in an alien cause is H. Thielicke in his *Death and Life* (*Tod und Leben*, 1947). In his survey of the various secular views of death and its significance for the meaning of life, he finds that only Heidegger has really seen our human situation for what it is. He then discards entirely the traditional correlation of physical death with original sin as its punishment. He insists that physical death is but the setting for something of a quite different order, a personal relation between the individual human being and his God. "The sting of death is sin", the consciousness of guilt is what invests death with the character of judgment. But this judgment is not something which is to occur at the close of the time-period allotted to me, it qualifies my life here and now from moment to moment. As one who must die, I am isolated, deprived of all outward support, and challenged by the all-knowing and all-righteous God. What refuge from him can I find? None whatever save in God himself. The very fact that death derives its terror from him is evidence enough that he is greater than it. I can therefore commit myself to him in the sure trust that he will defend me against it and will receive me to that eternal life which is his free gift.

II

In France, Jean-Paul Sartre has done little more than present to the reading public a sparkling and impudent version of Heidegger, taken in a pessimistic and atheistic sense. His philosophy is the expression of disgust with life. It is all so senseless and stupid, so nauseating, as he would say. He has voiced the widespread sense of futility and meaninglessness natural to a generation which has endured two world wars. "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity" is the creed of so many already that we need no one to come along and advocate it as Sartre does.

In his *L'Existentialisme est un humanisme*, a lecture delivered in 1945 in Paris, he gives a clear and succinct account of his system. It arises out of French secularism and the problem it created. Advocates of the lay school met the objection that, if religion were banished from instruction, morality would go with it, by asserting that moral values were independent of God's existence. Take away God, and the categorical imperative does not lose one iota of its dignity. Now, Sartre says, we see the result of that experiment. We took away God, and moral values went with him. So it was bound to be, for the only possible basis for a morality we do not make but simply find is in a God to whom we are responsible.

But if we suppose that Sartre will go on to urge that belief in the existence of God should be revived in order to stave off moral bankruptcy, we shall get a shock indeed. Such a step is for him quite impossible. He seldom argues for atheism, it is something to be

taken for granted. And we must face what that involves. We have left behind us for ever a morality which we do not make but simply find. Henceforth, it is either no morality at all or one which we manufacture for ourselves. He says frankly: "I'm quite vexed that that's the way it is; but if I've discarded God the Father, there has to be someone to invent values. . . . Life has no meaning *a priori*. Before you come alive, life is nothing; it's up to you to give it a meaning, and value is nothing else but the meaning that you choose". (*Existentialism,* trans. Frechtman, 58.) Man is terribly alone. The world is a vast and gloomy cavern the walls of which echo and re-echo Nietzsche's slogan, "God is dead". It is not for us to repine at this, but to accept it as our starting-point. In the storms which break upon us, there are no stars by which to steer. We must therefore tie a lantern to the masthead and direct our course by that. If someone objects that this is poor guidance, Sartre replies that the only alternative is to go down with all hands.

But if each of us is to manufacture his own standards, will not the result be sheer anarchy? "Everything is permissible if God does not exist" (*Ibid.,* 27). Two considerations are put forward to mitigate this somewhat terrifying suggestion. In the first place, Sartre urges that no man lives to himself, that he always stands in some relation to other persons. These are therefore involved in any action of his and account must be taken of that fact. The values he manufactures will have a bearing on others as well as on himself and he, the manufacturer, must keep this in mind. In the second place, Sartre finds in freedom a criterion by which to distinguish between alternative moralities. Since man is "condemned to freedom", as he puts it many times, no morality can be sound which presupposes determinism. And since freedom is the *summum bonum,* we can say that a morality is better than others in proportion as it aims more consciously at freedom. "The one thing that counts is knowing whether the inventing that has been done, has been done in the name of freedom" (*Ibid.,* 56). But does this really help us? To be "condemned to freedom" means that one *must* act freely. What sense then is there in saying that one *ought* to do so?

Sartre's ideas are probably best known in this country from his plays. One of these, *The Flies,* conveys his criticism of religion. It is in his eyes a mere mass of scruples, maintained in their own interests by kings and priests. In a moment of mystical illumination Orestes shakes off this obsession and asserts himself. "I'll take no one's orders, neither man's nor god's". He proposes to free his people by taking on himself their guilt, and he slays his mother, refusing afterwards to entertain any compunction for the act. "My crime is wholly mine; I claim it as my own, for all to know, it is my glory, my life's work, and you can neither punish me nor pity me. That is why I fill you with fear". In a second play, *In*

Camera, he develops a cynical estimate of human relationships. The grim conclusion is: "Hell is . . . other people". Other people, that is, function only as restraints upon the free expression of one's individuality. They are rival centres of freedom, so that they can only live at one's expense. Man is a wolf to man, and love itself is but the passion to possess, to make another the instrument of one's freedom.

III

It is with immense relief that one turns from the atheistic pessimism of Sartre to the virile thinking of Karl Jaspers. One can only regret that he is so little known and so sadly misunderstood in this country. Thus, a reviewer in the "Times Literary Supplement" recently bracketed him with Heidegger as one of those who "condemn man to anguish and abandon him in that situation". Nothing could be farther from the truth. His book on *The Spiritual Situation of the Time* (*Die Geistige Situation der Zeit,* 1931) was translated into English under the title *Man in the Modern Age* (1933) but little notice was taken of it. It is to be hoped that *The European Spirit* just published will meet with better fortune. A short account of him is available in Werner Brock's *Introduction to Contemporary German Philosophy* (1935). But by far the best work on Jaspers has been done in French, notably by Mikel Dufrenne and Paul Ricoeur (*Karl Jaspers et La Philosophie de l'Existence,* 1947), with a preface from Jaspers himself. It is good to find Karl Barth writing appreciatively of him in the latest volume of his *Dogmatik*. He speaks of the "high ethical and religious value" of his thought and discerns in it an "almost prophetic character".

For Jaspers, philosophy is rooted in faith. By faith he means a personal venture, in face of the hazards and frustrations of life, on one's highest insights. It is, to borrow a striking phrase from W. E. Hocking, the will to "go out and meet the Absolute in the darkness". The meaning of life is made known as we are prepared to accept life with courage. When we adopt this attitude, we find that we are not alone, that the Transcendent, the Godhead — Jaspers prefers such terms to "God"—is with us. For the paradox of God's dealing with us is that his best revelation is his strictest reticence. He does not break in to deliver us. He throws us on our own resources, because only so can he bring us to our full selfhood. Here we see what, for Jaspers, distinguishes philosophical from religious faith. The latter has access to an authoritative revelation which relieves us in part or whole of the necessity of going to warfare at our own charges.

Among the hazards of life, there are some whose special property it is to force us back upon ourselves and so upon what lies

beyond ourselves. These are called limit-situations. Among them may be mentioned suffering, guilt, conflict, and death. These are not events which I can understand, classify, and dispose of. They are trials which I can only meet by being born again, while not to meet them is to consent to some form of spiritual destruction. The poignant and searching nature of death is best seen when we consider what it means to lose someone whom we love. Here is one with whom my whole being was bound up, and now he is dead. I am overwhelmed by my loss, fearfully alone. The world was a home while he was in it, it is a wilderness now he is gone. We had shared every experience up to this moment, but this last experience we could not share. I have no right to comfort myself with any proofs that the soul is immortal, and in any case nothing of the kind can satisfy my yearning for the one who has been taken from me. We can no more speak to each other, communication between us has become impossible. But I can hallow his memory in my heart, I can preserve the will to share life with him, and trust that this will again become possible. But I cannot *know* that it will be possible; it may not. Only as I face undaunted the prospect of a final emptiness can I become such that eternal life is open to me.

In his recent book *The Apocalypse of History* (1948), Dr. E. Lampert has made skilful use of one of Jaspers' most suggestive ideas, the symbolism of the Law of the Day and the Passion of the Night. This is the familiar contrast between classic and romantic, Apollo and Dionysius, the ordered stabilities of civilization and the furies of a revolutionary outburst. We yearn for security and the rational conduct of life, but with these we stagnate. Then we cry out for adventure, for "one crowded hour of glorious life", but with this we become restless creatures of impulse. God reveals himself under both these forms, in intellect and emotion, in the blessings of peace and the horrors of strife. Shall we follow Dr. Lampert and say that he reveals himself in Western Europe with its foundations laid deep in classical antiquity and the Bible and in Eastern Europe with its dynamic atheism? The Bible sounds the apocalyptic note, and perhaps God is with us today alike in the values we must defend and in the storm which threatens to sweep them away. For, as Jaspers would put it, he only can have God as Friend who is willing to accept him at the same time as Enemy.

IV

The last name on my list is that of Gabriel Marcel, one of those brilliant French intellectuals who passed over from secularism to Catholicism between the two world wars. A recent publication brings the essentials of his thought within the reach of the English reader (*The Philosophy of Existence,* trans. Manya Harari, 1948). But the best introduction is that provided by a group of French

writers, Etienne Gilson being foremost among them (*Existentialisme chrétien: Gabriel Marcel,* 1947). If there is a striking affinity at many points between Marcel and Jaspers, that is not because the Frenchman is directly indebted to the German. He assures us that he had reached definite conclusions before he had read either Jaspers or Kierkegaard. A very valuable study of the relations between the two philosophers has now been made by Paul Ricoeur (*Gabriel Marcel et Karl Jaspers,* 1947). Common to both is an appreciation of the profound mystery of the individual human being with the responsibility of freedom and its tragic possibilities. Common to both also is something quite lacking in Kierkegaard, the clear insight that just as we become ourselves only in and through our relation to God (to the Transcendent, Jaspers would say), so we become ourselves only as we enter into binding commitments to our fellows, giving our very selves to them and receiving in return from them.

The Philosophy of Existence reproduces in its last essay the autobiographical note which Marcel contributed to *Existentialisme chrétien.* He is himself quite well aware of the pedigree of his ideas. He was an only child, deprived of his mother in early years but still under the influence of her gracious personality. In the war of 1914-18 he served with the Red Cross in one of its information bureaux. His duties required him to interview relatives of men reported "missing", and he learned then how poignant a thing it is to be a human being faced with the grim fact of death.

It is only possible here to deal with one point in Marcel's thought, the importance he attaches to fidelity.

This is in the first instance fidelity to oneself. Fidelity to oneself is not a virtue which may or may not be practised, as a mere external decoration of the self, so to speak. It is of the very essence of the self. On what grounds, for example, do I say that I am today the same person that I was twenty years ago? The final ground is that I am willing to acknowledge now what I did then, my errors and sins included, to count these my own and to accept responsibility for them. A case of dissociation is not psychological merely, it is ethical as well. It is a case of disloyalty to one's past. A person declares that a guilty action was not his, he declines to repent of it and make reparation for it. So he detaches it from himself and may even go so far as to construct out of it a separate self with a name of its own. But fidelity applies to the future as well as to the past. It is the property of man to make promises and to keep them. There are only two possibilities open to me in this connection. One is to drift aimlessly into the future, in which case it is no more my future than anybody else's. The other is to shape the future by giving pledges, undertaking obligations, and then remaining faithful to them.

We may speak next of fidelity to others. This is the only possible basis of a common life, that you and I remain true to the spoken word and the plighted faith. Nor are you and I fixed magnitudes to which our relation is attached subsequently as something external to us. We are in fact transformed by our relation, we create each other by means of it. Love is the highest instance of this. In love we bring out the true self in one another by reverence, loyalty, and self-giving.

Finally, there is a fidelity towards God. Here, of course, the relation is one-sided. God is not created by my fidelity to Him, I am by His to me. Marcel declares that his philosophy can be summed up in the words: "Ye are not your own." As Jaspers would express it, the final insight into the nature of the self is that it is a gift received, a grace shown. I have not made myself, I have been given to myself and must remain faithful to the trust.

In conclusion, we may be content with one remark of a general character. In face of this new movement of thought, are we not compelled to rethink the question of the relation between philosophy and theology? In a familiar passage, Pascal contrasted the God of the patriarchs with the God of the philosophers. But what happens to this antithesis when Pascal himself is reckoned among the philosophers? Kierkegaard enriched philosophy with ideas drawn from the Bible. Can we any longer oppose philosophical and Biblical thinking as sharply as some still do? Barth and Brunner tell us that the philosopher constructs an idol by his own reasoning and calls it God. Such language may be appropriate to Aristotle, but is it in place with Jaspers and Marcel? A type of philosophy has come into being which lives by faith, and we cannot afford to be hostile to it.

NOTE.—Since the above was written Eric Blow has translated E. Mounier's study of Existentialism under the title *Existentialist Philosophies*. It is much more accurate than the Italian books mentioned above, but is extremely difficult to read.

OUR COMMON NEEDS

A GERMAN'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL CONDITION OF EUROPE

By Hermann Klitscher

A recent visit to England has strengthened the conviction formed on earlier visits that in our outlook and in the fundamentals of our way of life the English people and the German people who have stood opposed to each other in two world wars are nevertheless very largely in agreement. We have the same conception of marriage, of the family, of property, and of vocation as a life-work, which we have ourselves to shape but which also shapes us. We have the same deep moral intuitions of right and wrong. We join in appreciating the man who is honest, reliable, kindhearted, honourable. We both lay store more by what men are than by what they seem.

The essential difference between us seems to me to be this: that the best Germans give themselves to creative mental activity, such as has made possible masterpieces in science and art, especially in music, while the best Englishmen endeavour to master practical life as well. The English are thus a pattern to us in their political maturity, their capacity to develop public opinion and to make it effective, and to bring might and right into unison; also in their wonderful sense of humour, which is a match for every situation. Both peoples can feel respect and regard for each other, and can learn much from each other, learning in such a way that each absorbs into its own life what is most valuable in the other's life, without causing itself any injury.

The English people are gradually coming to understand that the lot of the German people has been to go a way of suffering which is the result of a spiritual development common to both peoples, and which, though outwardly it has manifested itself in a war of extermination against the other people, in fact equally reflects something in that other people and is a warning to them. All mankind is at present in the grip of a spiritual crisis. This has discharged itself with explosive force in Germany, to our ruin and to others' ruin as well. What is the cause of this crisis? It is that faith in eternal truths has been increasingly displaced by faith in human capacities and human dexterity. Men have believed, many still do believe, that they can and may shape the world according to their own standards. We have believed that we carried our destiny in our own hands. Such an attitude appears in our pride in human intelligence

and its discoveries, in scientific achievements and in material possessions. It appears above all in our lust for power. We Germans know now from experience where such a belief leads. But in truth it is not belief, but unbelief. Scientific knowledge was applied for destructive purposes instead of constructive. Men were used and abused like things. The eternal values and laws were despised. That is where faith in man leads, if it is faith in man who no longer needs God. And we Germans have lost this faith in man. That is the terrifying thing about our life today. We know, from our own experience and suffering, how weak and impotent man is. We no longer have any pride in our own thinking, our plans and our activities. Our very existence can regain meaning only if it is found to possess fundamental values which reach out beyond our own little lives as individuals, and for which we can feel reverence.

What is Europe's spiritual condition in the world at present? Europe is the meeting-point of East and West. That is its destiny. And Europe is a real entity. Its peoples are bound together through an inter-related economy and a single culture, rooted partly in geography and climate but also in a common historical development. Europe has always stood as a unit in self-protection from the East; for it is from the East that the danger of annihilation has always threatened Europe. The peoples of Europe have had the same decisive spiritual experiences. They have the same confessions, customs and usages, the same social order. Europe is a family of nations. Despite all tensions and all formal differentiations, what is essential for all these nations is what they have in common. And each brings this common element to fruition in its own way.

Spiritually, as well as geographically, Europe stands between East and West. The East has for long professed a mystical devotion to the service of the community. The West professes its conviction that the freedom of personality must be respected. We Europeans have as our destiny the task of transforming this contrast into a genuine tension which may be resolved into a higher combination. The two great and powerful mysteries in life of freedom and interrelatedness belong together. We recognize, indeed, that both of them—personal freedom and communal relations—have their place. We must search for what will reconcile them. And we shall find it, though as yet we have no clear idea in what direction to search.

We Germans have lived through the assault of Eastern thinking and the Eastern way of life. It brought us standards which take no account of freedom or of personality. We know this, and we know why now we are resisting with all our might the fresh assault from the East. Our very life is at stake. In the last resort what is at stake is the belief that there is something in life which has an absolute value, in the place of which nothing else whatever can stand as an adequate substitute. Each of us thinks of his home in this

way. The mother thinks of her child, the lover of his beloved. The religious man thinks of God so. We are concerned here with what is most personal and vital for us, with things the value of which admits of no doubt. But for the man with no beliefs, for the nihilist, everything is replaceable, nothing is worth being believed in. Consequently no one has any responsibility. The personal life of the individual can claim no rights, and he becomes but an atom in the collective mass.

Our belief, nevertheless, stands firm. It is that underlying the spiritual life of man is not unavoidable coercion but a law which he should follow. In the freedom of decision and self-determination man can become free. Only then is he a moral being. The voice of conscience he discovers to be not an external authority but the voice of his own being. Our belief is that every man is a little world of his own, with a framework which is personal and his own. It embraces an unfathomable mystery, which is to be reverenced. The dignity of man is something which must not be violated. And all this first came to be fully understood and accepted as a consequence of the Christian religion.

In the political sphere this conception of man takes on a democratic form. Two conditions are required for its realization: tolerance and a readiness for compromise. For us Germans these things are foreign and suspect. They have been transmitted to us in a garbled and distorted form. We must learn to gain insight into their meaning. For there will always be difference of opinion, and we must accept this patiently if we want our own opinion to be respected. Tolerance is wrong only when intolerant men endanger the common life, as has happened in Germany. And we can always go forward, even if only a step at a time, so long as we understand each other and are willing for compromise. Compromise is in no way a sign of weakness; on the contrary, it is a sign of strength. It is important that those who are outvoted and in a minority should not be eliminated or forgotten. Those who govern have power not against the minority but on its behalf, and must try to understand its criticisms. And it is from the English people that we can best learn how to set about this.

The present situation demands above all that we should strive towards a right ordering of our social life. Our aim is European Socialism, the fair synthesis between the Liberalism of the West and the Communism of the East, between Capitalism and Collectivism. Each of us as individuals must be clear that the other man's fundamental rights are for me duties, and that my own rights are duties for those in my community. The new European order will be a social order, or it will be nothing.

But that is not enough. For men to live together in peace it is necessary for them to have confidence and personal sympathies.

The deepest and strongest power which binds men together we call love. In our experience of this we all know that it is a gift, a grace; that in it is revealed for each of us a higher power, which shapes our life. The religious man recognizes it as something which comes from God. He desires to do God's will, that is, he does not shut God out, he is ready to let God work in and through him. The new European order will be Christian, or it will be nothing. This remains true, even though most people have no interest in ecclesiastical matters. Indeed, even where all thoughts of Church and confession are to seek, Christianity is present in our whole Western way of life, is present as an invisible power in all our behaviour, in our convictions and our ideas of civilization. It gives man an assured dignity over against what is finite and at the same time it insists on his limitations over against what is infinite. For the Christian, man as God's creature depends on a higher power, and is at one and the same time free and responsible.

Without faith man cannot live. That is why Fascism, National-Socialism and Communism are at bottom political religions, substitute religions; for in them something transitory and of this world is given the highest place—the nation, the race, it may be, or class. Despite their efforts, men find they *must* have something to believe in. Consequently we are each called upon today to decide for ourselves: "Do you believe in man, or do you believe in God?" That is what it comes to. And in political terms, "Do you believe in the power of the State, or do you believe in the spiritual freedom of man?" The best in both the English and the German people is nourished from the two deepest roots of the spiritual life which we have in common: our religious faith and our social conscience. It is these we must build on, if we are to save the dignity of man.

What can we do ourselves? More than we suppose. It is of no hazy idealism that I am thinking. Life itself is a risky business today. To go through with it requires courage. We must find what our place in this world really is. And what we need is not great speeches or great actions by statesmen. What we need, and what we can do ourselves, is, in the limits set by our own daily tasks, to allow that to be real which we have recognized as right. To be effective, such behaviour must proceed from the innermost places of our being. I must therefore begin by putting my own inner life in order. Words are of small avail. We must live and behave according to these ultimate things. We should openly confess, moreover, that we believe in God, and in the God of the Christian religion. And today this needs courage.

In all these things which to me seem essential, I find agreement in the thought of our two countries. We must learn to know each other personally, so as properly to understand each other. That is why every possibility of meeting is so important. It is the most

fruitful starting-point for mutual understanding. We Germans need this personal contact quite especially, for we do not know how to appraise correctly what is foreign. We are inclined either to overestimate or to underestimate its value. Only if we learn to live together can we learn to work together. On both sides everything possible should be done to facilitate meetings between our peoples. We need each other; and only so can the prejudices, misunderstandings and rivalries which still divide us be overcome. Only so can we become good Europeans. Europe is not yet lost. Europe will recover when we stand with, and for, each other.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

It is a pity that the Rev. H. G. G. Herklots' *Amsterdam 1948* (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.) has been given such an uninteresting cover, for it contains a very good account—informative and candid—of the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches which is suitable for wide circulation. Questions for discussion are included for the use of study circles.

The Young Traveller in Australia (Phœnix House, 7s. 6d.), by Kathleen Monypenny, tells in story form the experiences of some children who have nine months of travel in the southern half of Australia. In very delightful fashion they convey much information to the reader about the land, inhabitants and customs there. This excellent book, well illustrated and fully indexed, is in the "Young Traveller Series" for children of about 12 to 15 years of age.

Some hair-raising experiences are recorded in Archdeacon A. B. Lloyd's *A Life's Thrills* (Lutterworth, 6s. 6d.) as the foreground of his memoirs; their background is the Church Missionary Society at work in Uganda in the past fifty-five years.

The Lesson notes in *The Beginners' Concise Guide, 1949* (Religious Education Press, 4s.), edited by Mr. E. H. Hayes, are of a consistently high standard. Primary, Junior, Senior and Young People's Guides have been published, price 5s. each.

All The Days (Salvationist Supplies, Ltd., 2s.) is a short account of the life and work of General George L. Carpenter, general of the Salvation Army from 1939-46, by Alfred J. Gilliard, written in a simple and plain style, and depicting the character of an able, zealous and hard-working Christian.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

Civilisation and Religious Values (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), by Dr. H. D. A. Major, contains the Hibbert Lectures for 1946. It deals with the relevance of religion to civilization and is a plea for such an adaptation of Christianity to modern culture as to make it attractive to scientific humanists who approve of the Christian ethic but not of the historic doctrines of Christianity.

A very different plea is made by M. Marc Boegner in the 1948 Burge Memorial Lecture, *Western Civilisation and Christianity* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.). "The Church is not called upon to be the rampart of any civilisation, whatsoever it may be. Her mission is not to save Western Civilisation". "The Church must become again what she was at the epochs of creative faithfulness: the pioneer of real community life", but "not to save a civilisation" . . .

In *The Soul of a Prophet* (S.P.C.K., 1s.), two lectures on the Charles Gore foundation, Gore's biographer, Dr. G. L. Prestige, asks some searching questions about decisiveness and liberality, personal and ecclesiastical, with Gore as "the pivot of our enquiries". In a further Gore lecture, *The Future of Anglicanism* (S.P.C.K., 6d.), Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson suggests that "it is towards Churches standing within the tradition of Evangelical Christendom, rather than towards either Orthodoxy or Rome, that in the first instance the efforts and hopes of ecclesiastical statesmen should be directed". "It is possible to be over-rigid".

In his *Presidential Address* to the British Academy (Cumberlege, 1s. 6d.) Sir H. Idris Bell calls for unyielding opposition not only to all political threats to liberty of thought, but to the "even deadlier" danger, "peculiarly characteristic of our own times", of "enslavement to our own theories": "*parti pris* bids fair to be reckoned a virtue".

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

(*The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise*)

Sonship. By K. L. Carrick Smith, M.A. Independent Press. 1s. 6d.

"I do not see how anyone, except the completely intolerant and bigoted, can read it without a growing wonder at the largeness and richness of the Christian Gospel . . ." So wrote Professor T. W. Manson in *The Manchester Guardian* of Miss Carrick Smith's recent book, *The Church and the Churches.* Such strong commendation from so balanced a critic aroused keen expectation of what Miss Carrick Smith would write next, and the expectation is justified. *Sonship* is brief—purposely, so "that everyone could find time to read what is written"; but its quality is prophetic, indeed piercing. It cannot be overlooked.

" 'To Christian men Jesus is the normal and normative religious person.' When I first read that sentence [from A. M. Fairbairn] it hit me. I did not know whether to think it self-evident or blasphemous." Starting from here, the writer shows that "The Son of Man whom we see portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels was one *who lived by faith, as we must do*" (her italics); yet "Jesus did not regard Himself as exercising unique power. He expected those who followed Him to share without qualification the resources at His own disposal". "Jesus indeed stands in a special relation to God, but He is also the means whereby we are brought into the same relation. We talk much of being saved *from sin*; we perceive too little that we are being saved for and *into* sonship. And this is our real need." "His total filial dependence on the Father is to become our natural and habitual attitude in all things": this is what sonship means, and sonship is a conception common alike to the Synoptic Gospels, to *John* and to the Epistles.

The second part of the pamphlet consists of a searching exposure of "our own religion to the light of Jesus, making this our touchstone: *that nothing is of the Holy Spirit which does not proceed from, accord with or foster in us the filial consciousness of Jesus*". Our mental preoccupations, private prayers, public worship, church activities, denominational loyalties, theological studies, appeals to history, blueprints for reunion—all in turn are exposed; and "we begin to find that only the violent metaphors of Scripture are able to express what happens. 'The axe is being laid to the root of the tree.' Someone 'has come to cast fire upon the earth'—like prairie fire, making all bare in its train". Christ comes working havoc "among our cherished religious ideas and preconceptions. It is indeed a death to let them go, and in that dying there is nothing but naked faith to assure us that we are not losing God. But such death, willingly embraced, is the beginning of eternal life". For its result is "that we gain Christ": as St. Paul did when "he let the mind of Jesus root up his churchmanship".

This little book is written not only with painful sincerity but with the kind of courage which forces the reader to face the issue or know himself to be a coward. It is written by one who has recently become a Congregationalist, and her vision is offered in the first instance to our own fellowship. I hope her words will be weighed, and her vision caught, throughout our churches.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

The Glass of Vision. The Bampton Lectures for 1948. By AUSTIN FARRER, D.D. Dacre Press. 12s. 6d.

These lectures form a theological sequel to the author's philosophical work *Finite and Infinite*. Their subject is the knowledge of God, the Infinite Creator, by the finite creature. Their object is to show that this knowledge, while in part natural, must be in its highest form supernatural and that it has been given to man in the form of Scripture imagery. All knowledge of God is indeed by way of images. Our natural knowledge of Him is through analogies drawn from created things—our supernatural knowledge comes through images given to man by Divine inspiration. Dr. Farrer is concerned to commend the reading of Scripture as an irreplaceable mode of access to God.

To see what is implied, we must consider the reflection of reason upon the images that we form of God. To reflect upon the analogical images naturally arising in the mind is the work of metaphysic, which effects a criticism of them in the endeavour to reduce them to unity. Such work is not to be despised, but taken alone it leads only to a negative knowledge of God—His Divine essence transcends all the images we naturally form of Him. If we are to have a true knowledge of Him, He must reveal Himself. He has done this, in the first place, in the Incarnation. But even the Incarnation is not enough. This is where the supernatural images come in. God has given them to us for the interpretation of the Incarnation, first in the predictions of prophecy, and then in the Apostolic testimony.

Here again reason has its work in reflection, this time upon the Scriptural images. Some are seen to be fundamental; others are derivative and secondary. The fundamental images, *e.g.* that of the Sonship of Christ cannot be transcended by reason; they are authoritative. To try to go beyond them is only to reach abstractions—so our wisdom is to read Scripture and delight in its imagery. What is likest to its revelation of God is the way in which great poetry, such as Shakespeare's *Hamlet* or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, reveals man. In both cases the effect is reached through essential imagery; only that in Divine revelation the images are not naturally, but supernaturally given.

Anyone who has studied Dr. Farrer's *Finite and Infinite* will come to his new book with great expectations; nor will he be disappointed. The above brief outline of its contents might perhaps give the impression that they were on familiar lines. Apart from the illuminating comparison of Scripture with poetry (itself not new) Dr. Farrer follows Aquinas closely in his argument. Even the doctrine of Scripture images may be found in the *Summa Theologica*, where prophecy is dealt with. But to follow St. Thomas is nothing against Dr. Farrer: the saint is great enough to bear much repetition, and he comes to life in Dr. Farrer's pages, where his ideas are applied with both discernment and wit to the modern theological situation. *The Glass of Vision* is a model of logical cogency and felicitous expression. Above all, the author has put himself into it. As in *Finite and Infinite* he has achieved a notable book.

But there is, all the same, a point where I cannot follow Dr. Farrer. Agreeing warmly about the value of the devotional reading of Scripture (would there were more of it), I cannot accept the ban put upon the criticism of its images on the plea that they are supernaturally given. Modern restatement is often necessary, and is not to be denied. At a conference in Oxford many years ago a speaker made an indelible impression on my mind by suggesting that the right thing to do with a creed was not to reflect upon it, but to *sing* it! Dr. Farrer does not go that length; but I am afraid that his argument tends in the same direction. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

An Approach to Christology. By A. R. Vine, M.A., D.D., B.Sc. Independent Press. 21s.

The scholarship of this book is guaranteed by its having been awarded the D.D. degree of London University; but it is much more than a typical D.D. thesis. It is a genuine piece of constructive work on the grand scale: it represents a sustained effort of thought which is altogether admirable, and which I greatly admire, even though I am obliged to dissent from its final conclusion.

The work is in two parts. The first is a study of the *Bazaar of Heracleides*, the treatise in which the condemned and exiled Nestorius sought to defend his orthodoxy: in 1889 a Syriac translation of it was discovered, and has been much studied since that time. It is generally recognized that the statement is obscure; but Dr. Vine thinks that he can discern its meaning, which still has value as a starting point for a modern approach to Christology: such an approach forms the second and larger part of his book, and gives its name to the whole.

I must leave the specialists on Nestorius to decide how far Dr. Vine has successfully elucidated his obscurities, and will only summarize as much of the first part as is necessary for the understanding of the second. Nestorius accepted the Aristotelian metaphysic and the Nicene Creed; and upon this double basis endeavoured to build a Christology. What is essential to it is a comparison made between Adam and Christ. In creating Adam God the Word first formed man from the clay, and then breathed into him a living soul. This Divine breath, as separated from the Word, constituted the spirit in the human organism. Christ, as God incarnate, is similarly explained; only that the Word, uniting Himself to a human organism, does not this time separate Himself from it. After the union, the Divine and human natures remain conceptually entirely distinct, but there is one Divine-human *prosopon*, or manifestation of the Incarnate Word.

And now for Dr. Vine's approach to Christology from this beginning. Like Nestorius he sets out a metaphysic, and accepts credal authority; but the creeds which he uses are the Apostles' and the Athanasian, and the metaphysic, though it continues to have an Aristotelian basis, is constructed so as to take in the whole sweep of modern scientific knowledge. This is what I meant by saying that the work is done on the grand scale. I only wish I could spend time over this part of the book; however, I will only say that it is exhaustive, thorough and most suggestive. But before pressing on to the Christology, which after all is the main theme, I must note an important deviation from the Aristotelian theory of knowledge, which reflects its influence upon the way in which the Aristotelian metaphysic is finally accepted. This is a point of the greatest importance, when we come to judge of Dr. Vine's theological construction.

For Aristotle, provided that the rules of logic were observed, language was the equivalent of thought, and thought the equivalent of being: modern philosophical criticism has tended to prise apart the elements of this synthesis. Our thoughts are only symbols of being, and language only symbolical of thought. This modern epistemological attitude Dr. Vine accepts: the result is that all that we (or the creeds) say both of God and the world is expressed in symbols.

This being understood, we can proceed with his theology. God is to be thought of as the sum of all perfections; and this fullness of perfection applies to the different permanent phases (*prosopa*) in which God exists. These phases are known to us from the Divine manifestation in the world as creative, redemptive and directive; and we speak of them as the Three

Persons in the Godhead, but must not confuse "person" here with our notion of human personality, since the perfection of humanity is only a part of the perfection of God. "Our ideas of personality tend to make us individualize the Persons of the Trinity unduly" (p. 355).

And now, after the doctrine of the Trinity, that of the Incarnation. The Word, the Second Person of the Trinity, in order to achieve human redemption, while remaining the sum of all perfection, gathered together in one focus all those elements of being which belong to human perfection, and united them with an organism of flesh like ours. Thus the personality of Jesus, though human in its attributes, is nevertheless God the Word, so limited, but never separated from the Word as a whole in the fullness of Divine perfection. The Divine attributes which transcend humanity remain in abeyance during the earthly life of Jesus. But not altogether: they are, so to speak at the back of His mind, preventing Him from ever making a mistake; so that all His words are infallible, though it must be recognized that in many things He accommodated His utterances to the knowledge of those who heard Him. The Divine attributes further appear in His miracles; and when the human life of Jesus comes to an end, they are fully resumed: the Word, however, now retains the result of the human experience that has been sustained.

Dr. Vine considers that this Christology gives us all that we want, a Christ who is really God, but all the same is human as we are human. He sees that he comes somewhat dangerously near to Apollinarianism, the doctrine that in Jesus the Divine Word, or Divine Reason, took the place that human reason occupies in the rest of mankind. But he points to the difference from Apollinaris: in his own theory the personality of Jesus is found, not in the Word without qualification, but in the Word as limited to human perfection with the rest of the Divine attributes in reserve.

What is to be said of this doctrine? It is clear that according to it nothing like human personality arises until the self-limitation of the Word is accomplished. Why not say at once that the personality of Jesus is genuinely human, only continually sustained by and obedient to the Divine Word, which after all for Dr. Vine is not personal in the sense of human personality? It is argued by him against such a view, that it results in a schism of the Divine hypostasis of the Word, as though the human elements were broken off from the total sum. But I see no reason for such a schism: they can remain within the Word as the guiding principle of the life of Jesus, by which He was sustained and which He continually obeyed. Then we get rid of such difficulties as are involved in maintaining inerrancy where as a matter of fact it does not exist, and in speaking of an accommodation which comes dangerously near to insincerity. It seems to me that Dr. Vine's theory results in a far worse schism than anything he fears: he is constrained not merely to speak of accommodation, but actually also to recognize a double knowledge, Divine and human, in Jesus (p. 385). What can this imply, but a schism of His personality with a vengeance?

Apart from his formal Christology Dr. Vine has some excellent remarks on the religious valuation of Jesus, with which I can most cordially agree. In Him, he says, there is revealed as much of God as is possible within the terms of humanity. Bishop Gore is praised for his apt saying, that Jesus possesses the religious value of God. Only it is strange to quote Gore in this matter, who is but a secondary reference—why not go to the fountain-head of the doctrine of value-judgment in religion, and say at once "Ritschl"?

One word in conclusion. In all that has been said there has been no reference to the New Testament. But Dr. Vine quite rightly says that its language is symbolic, and must be interpreted from a total view of

Christianity. Such a total view is the object of theology, of which the very basis is the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Substantially I agree with his interpretation of the New Testament so far as concerns the doctrine of the Trinity: it is only when we come to Christology that I have to differ.

I should add that I think it is a pity that too often Dr. Vine has felt constrained to express his meaning in a complicated scholastic terminology of his own invention. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Origins of the Great Schism. By WALTER ULLMANN. Burns, Oates. 18s.

This is an interesting and learned book written from an unusual if rather narrow angle. Dr. Ullmann writes as a lawyer rather than as an historian and he attributes the Great Schism of the 14th Century (with some truth) to the lack of any constitutional machinery for getting rid of an unpopular Pope. The only remedy was a General Council, the only authority for calling a General Council was the Pope himself and so why should he commit political suicide? The only way out of this dilemma was by a return to first principles, but this, as represented by Conrad of Gelnhausen and Marsiglio of Padua, is rejected by Dr. Ullman as "pseudo-legal and meta-juristic," and he is at some unnecessary pains to show that Cardinal Zarabella, who is usually thought to belong to this school, was in fact distinct from it. Nevertheless the real issue was where Marsiglio placed it and the historian will not be impressed by Dr. Ullmann's unimaginative attachment to positive law in the solution of a problem caused by the breakdown of positive law. Equity, or, as he for some reason prefers to call it, *epieikeia*, may be in his view "amorphous" but for that very reason it is the only way to handle cases for which there are neither parallels nor precedents.
A. VICTOR MURRAY.

The Reformation in Denmark. By E. H. DUNKLEY, D.D. S.P.C.K. 13s. 6d.

The Reformation in Denmark was relatively swift and easy. Within the twenty years 1519-39 "the belief, worship and organization of the Danish Church was transformed from a Catholic to a Lutheran model; and there were "no martyrs." Indeed, "there is a refreshing absence both of actual persecution and of bitterness and violence in controversy," partly because "there were no sacramentarians."

The attitude of Christian II (1513-23) "has been described as that of 'pre-Lutheran Humanism' "; he "and some of his circle had already manifested their interest in the study of the Bible before Luther's name was on everyone's lips"; and, like Henry VIII, "he never closed the open Bible." The reign of Frederick I (1523-33), who refused to compel anyone to any form of belief, saw the beginning of the dissolution of the monasteries and a proclamation that "each one who has the grace may preach" what is "agreeable with Scripture." Christian III (1536-59), who was already a strong Lutheran at his accession, immediately arrested all seven bishops; and seven new superintendents were ordained by Bugenhagen, who had already crowned Christian *quasi verus episcopus*, as Luther said. This ordination service by a mere priest "was intended distinctly to mark a new beginning." It did so, in fact, "not only for the Church of Denmark, but for the Christian Church as a whole." As an Anglican, Dr. Dunkley regrets the consequent loss of apostolic succession, but acknowledges that the Danish Church has remained "little perturbed" by this.

Students of the Reformation will welcome this book, in which they can watch familiar developments in unfamiliar territory. We see the translation of the Bible into Danish, for example; the writing of Danish hymns; the marriage of priests; the establishment of a Protestant University, with a Professor of Hebrew (a knowledge of which, however, was "very rare"); and the appearance of a "National Church." The author, who believes that "the day of National Churches is yet to come," has based his work on Danish sources, from which copious quotations are given in footnotes. The text is in English and readable English. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics. By AUGUSTE LECERF. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

This very welcome addition to the Lutterworth Library is a translation of the two Parts of the *Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics* published in 1931 and 1938 when the author was 60 and 66 years old respectively. Dr. Lecerf's health was affected by the German occupation of France and when he died in 1943 he had not completed the "Reformed Dogmatics" of which these Parts were to have been Prolegomena. Most of us know more of the Neo-Calvinism of Barth than we do of the revival of Calvinism in Calvin's homeland of France and it is a great gain to have this lucid exposition of the principles of Calvinism from one who was the recognized leader of the French Calvinists.

Auguste Lecerf was not brought up in a Christian home. His parents were Communards who had fled to London after the suppression of the Communist movement in Paris in 1871, and it was in London that he was born. His conversion was due to Calvin's *Institution de la religion Chrétienne* which he picked up at a secondhand bookstall in Paris; at the age of 17, against the wishes of his family, he was baptized and studied later at the Protestant Faculty of Theology in Paris, which was then dominated by the Liberalism of Auguste Sabatier. It says much for Lecerf's independence of mind that the Thesis with which he completed his course was definitely Calvinistic in its teaching. Calvinism was not to him, as to many French Protestants of his time, a tryranny to be escaped. It was the form of Christianity to which he owed his conversion, and he became the convinced, and even rigid, exponent of Calvinist theology.

The First Part of this book is entitled "The Nature of Religious Knowledge." In it Dr. Lecerf rejects the Cartesianism of seventeenth century Calvinism with its attempt to construct an autonomous natural theology and expounds what he regarded as the true principles of Calvin himself, and criticizes other forms of the Philosophy of Religion from the standpoint of a moderate realism.

Part II deals with "The Foundation and Specification of Religious Knowledge." We found this of special interest. For Lecerf Calvinism was "the one strictly consistent form of Christian and Protestant theism"; "among Protestants, the strict theism of Calvinism is the only solid foundation for the authority of conscience." "Ethicalism must inevitably collapse" for it "forgets that man is nothing by himself". "The Protestantism that is itself a mere system of Jesuolatry is scarcely in a position to reproach Rome for Mariolatry". Lutheranism, Arminianism, Methodism, Biblical Sectarianism, are all criticized, and the claim is made that "Calvinism is purely and simply theism in Cosmology; œcumenical Christianity in objective soteriology; evangelical Protestantism in criteriology and subjective soteriology, formulated with all the logical consequences demanded by these various stages of Christian thought".

We who belong to the Reformed tradition should be grateful for this firm and confident exposition of the principles of Reformed theology. Yet not even Calvinism is a full and final statement of Christian theology. We need, like Calvin, to have a theology which is theocentric, and yet we may learn more than Lecerf was ready to recognize from those of other traditions. Even Calvinism for all its grandeur had its inadequacy and its limitations.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley. By J. ERNEST RATTENBURY, D.D. Epworth Press. 15s.

The main text of this book occupies eight chapters and 158 pages. Three brief "Addenda" occupy the next fifteen pages, and these are followed by a reprint of extracts from *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* (1673) by Daniel Brevint, Dean of Lincoln, and the complete text of the 166 eucharistic hymns of the Wesleys. The purpose of the book is, by careful commentary on these hymns, with constant reference to the work of Brevint which is shown to be the immediate source of their doctrine, to commend to contemporary Methodists the great need for a new revival of sacramentalism as the hymns expound it. In that sense the book is theological rather than hymnological; and in the carrying out of this high purpose its success is evident. The commentary itself is apt without being (as such commentaries well may be) either tedious or anecdotal. The theology of the Eucharist which lies behind it is one which will find much sympathy far beyond the bounds of the Methodist Church. The sixth chapter, "Sacrifice and the Altar", seems a wholly admirable defence of primitive doctrine and when the author insists on the necessity for crudity in the expressions of the doctrine of the Atonement, deriving that necessity from the essential "scandalousness" of the Cross, he is not only competent but moving. It is only in details that we dare to find fault. Lapses in English syntax are rather too frequent to make the reading of the book completely comfortable. The author's interpretation of "This is My body" is perhaps a little dangerous. His impatience with archaisms is sometimes, perhaps, carried too far. But these are small points in a really outstanding book.

ERIK ROUTLEY.

The Old Catholic Movement, its Origins and History. By C. B. MOSS, D.D. S.P.C.K. 15s.

"There are now seven Old Catholic Churches: those of Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, and Yugo-Slavia, and the 'National Polish Church', the headquarters of which is in America". After the first World War "the total number of Old Catholics in Europe was about 170,000". "They bear witness that it is possible to be Latin or 'Western' Catholics without being Ultramontane; they resemble the Roman Communion in their liturgy and law, the Orthodox Communion in their creed, the Anglican Communion in their theological position, and the Continental Protestants in their Teutonic mentality". The Dutch Old Catholics trace their origin to the revolt of the Chapter of Utrecht against the Jesuits' claim "that the Roman Catholic Church in the Dutch Republic was a mere mission, governed by a vicar-apostolic who was appointed and removed by the Pope at his discretion": this was as early as 1724. The rest arose by way of protest against the papal claim to infallibility as *de fide* at the Vatican Council of 1870. "To recognize as Divinely revealed something *that is not true in itself*, let him who can, do it", wrote Hefele to Döllinger. "I cannot". The various groups united in the Declaration of Utrecht in 1889, which, Dr. Moss thinks, "may yet prove to have been a turning-point in the history of the reunion of Christendom".

This book is the crown of a lifetime's work and interest, begun in undergraduate days. Patiently and clearly, sometimes with dry humour, the different strands are traced: Gallicanism, Jansenism, Febronianism. And in 1870 "the Vatican Council put an end to Gallicanism in all its forms". Yet "the Vatican Council did no more than fill up the gaps in the Tridentine system. Gallicanism was not a permanently tenable theory; for it gave the Pope either too much or too little". Dr. Moss writes from the High Church point of view, for which the preservation of the episcopal succession is all-important (and even exciting, as when the one Old Catholic bishop alive, "on his way home one dark night, fell into a canal, and was with difficulty kept above water till help arrived"); though he recognizes the awkwardness of the implication that an excommunicated bishop "can go about the world consecrating bishops and ordaining priests at his own discretion . . . filling the world with irregular bishops and priests". Free Churchmen will note with interest that, Anglican though he is, he holds that "Church and State cannot be one society without the gravest damage to both"; also that, though the action of the Chapter of Utrecht in electing a rival bishop "was undoubtedly an act of schism", yet "if their doctrinal position was true, their schism was justified: no one is bound to adhere to bishops whom he believes to be heretical". These quotations will indicate some of the points which arise in the discussion (and are sharply relevant to modern questions of Order); they fail to convey fully the writer's fine learning and candour.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Civilization On Trial. By ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

The author of *A Study of History* has put us even more irreparably in his debt with this book, in which he discloses some of his further reflections upon the nature of history. It consists of thirteen essays, based on addresses given for the most part in the last two years. The most significant advance in Profesor Toynbee's thought is his new assessment of the historical rôle of Christianity. Hitherto he held that it was a chrysalis in which at the time of the breakdown of one great culture certain treasures were laid, in order to break out into a new culture at the appropriate time. But now we read that the birth and death of civilizations is to be seen as directed to an advance in religious insight through the sufferings in which cultures die and are born. Thus we may claim not unfairly that Professor Toynbee makes the Cross and Resurrection the very key to the understanding of history; and, if the reviewer may adapt a phrase from the first essay, we could say that all history is theologically contemporary. This is a work of the utmost importance to theologians and to all who seek to understand the puzzle of our times in Christian terms.

JOHN MARSH.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The two following books are for the devotional life: *Draw Near to God* by D. H. Southgate (Oxford Press, 6s.); *The Eternal Purpose* by D. Tait Patterson (Carey Press, 15s.). In their different ways both will help to a fuller religious life, and to a daily habit of prayer. The first is a book of meditations. These are under main heads such as "The way of Christian discipleship" and "Obstacles in the way"; there are also meditations for the chief days of the Christian year. Perhaps here and there one senses too much self-introspection; but there is also a freshening wind.

The Eternal Purpose is completely Biblical throughout; it is, as Mr. Patterson says, "a method of devotion resting upon and sustained by the use of the Holy Scriptures." There are devotions for each day in the year; they are well chosen, especially for Advent and Lent. All the prayers, the readings, and the meditations are Scripture passages; a full index at the end gives the references. This is a book of much more than ordinary interest. It builds on the Bible, and it rests on the Bible. In using it the reader may wish to supplement it with some of the prayers from the great liturgies of the Church; but the Bible comes out here as the greatest of all. The text used is the A.V., and there is neither note nor comment. Mr. Patterson has done a very valuable piece of work.

The Cost of Discipleship by Dietrich Bonhoeffer (S.C.M., 9s.) has been translated by Mr. R. H. Fuller. The author was a minister of the German Confessional Church, and lost his life under Hitler for his Christian loyalty. This book contains papers on Christian discipleship, and on the Sermon on the Mount; they reflect a profoundly Christian character, fearless and self-effacing. Dr. Leibholz contributes an appreciative memoir of the author. There is a foreword by the Bishop of Chichester.

Mr. David Daiches' *Robert Louis Stevenson* (Maclellan, 7s. 6d.) is a fair and in some ways generous revaluation of Stevenson's work; coming after a period of eclipse it will be welcomed by lovers of R.L.S. Mr. Daiches is not slow to see the master's hand in Stevenson's work. Whether there is as much autobiography in it as Mr. Daiches rather suggests is a question; but the modern game of playing the detective on an author's private life is not literary criticism, and happily Mr. Daiches keeps the right path. No doubt there is a pose in R.L.S., an *elegance* in his style, especially in the essays which are largely his apprentice work. But what would not one give to be able to write a sentence like the opening one of *Treasure Island*? Even if Stevenson's "fulfilment" is the fragment of the *Weir of Hermiston*, his permanent hold on many of us will always be *Kidnapped* and *Treasure Island*.

The Rev. Norman Snaith's *I Believe In . . .* (S.C.M., 6s.) is an exposition of the Nicene Creed "in non-theological language, that is, in words readily understood by the regular reader." The chapters are based on articles contributed originally to the *Methodist Recorder*. The exposition follows in the main a strictly orthodox course: but one hopes that what is said about "last things" will not be the final word when the books are opened.

Dr. Eric W. Baker's *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival* (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.) is a critical inquiry into the relations of William Law and John Wesley. That Law did influence Wesley deeply in Wesley's early days is certain; but it is also certain that Wesley afterwards diverged far

from Law. He broke away from Law's mysticism; and in theology there was a sharp severance. It would seem a just verdict to say that after 1738 little remained of Law's influence except the initial moral appeal of Law's *Christian Perfection* and the *Serious Call*. This seems to be Dr. Baker's conclusion, and it is much nearer the facts than the more extreme estimates of Law's influence. Did not Wesley take fairly consistently his own line in the revival and in the Societies he formed? This is a book which is full of interest.

Reasonable Living by T. E. Jessop (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.). This little book by the Professor of Philosophy in the University College of Hull deserves an attentive hearing. It is a plain but critical account of the place of reason in religion and morality; and an inquiry into modern tendencies in religious belief, in citizenship, and in politics. Professor Jessop pleads for the education of the people in those final realities on which a sound life must rest. As things are we are at sea. Because of an uncertain hold on the background truths which make for our peace, we are at the mercy of the group-mind and the prey of the specialist. This book is the work of a finely wrought Christian mind.

Dr. F. W. Boreham's *Cliffs of Opal* (Epworth Press, 6s.) contains some thirty papers on various subjects. They have the characteristics which have given pleasure to so many readers. Many of the papers are biographical. They include names as diverse as Donne, George Herbert, Moody, Patrick and Branwell Brontë, and Mark Rutherford. It seems that once on a day Watts-Dunton and Swinburne invited Rutherford to "The Pines." In the course of conversation Watts-Dunton asked Mark, "Do you read Rudyard Kipling?" "No," he replied, "I am getting to be an old man now, and I read my Bible." "Ah," said Watts-Dunton, "that's what I do."

Dr. Herbert Gray's *Finding God* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) has for its main object, "to show, by using the testimonies of real people, that the ways into the fellowship of God are very numerous." A. T. S. JAMES.

Professor B. S. Easton, in *The Pastoral Epistles* (S.C.M., 10s. 6d.), has written a first-rate commentary of great usefulness both to the student and to the working minister. An introduction discusses the usual questions, such as the purpose of the Epistles and their relation to Paul. Their author is an ardent admirer of the Apostle, and the order of the Epistles, written between about A.D. 95 and 105, is *2 Timothy, Titus, 1 Timothy*. Professor Easton gives his own translation, which is fresh and vivid, and each section of the translation is followed first by a simple exposition, and then by a more detailed examination of specific points. The most valuable part of a valuable commentary is the "Word Studies", which comprise the latter section of the volume. The key words in the Epistles, arranged in alphabetical order according to their English equivalents (e.g., "faith", "grace", "righteous", "saviour"), are discussed in relation to their use in other parts of the New Testament. Some of the longer "Word Studies" constitute historical sketches of the use of the terms in pagan as well as in Christian writings. Recourse is had to the latest lexicographical research. This is also the first commentary on the Pastorals freely to use the Church Orders, especially Hippolytus and the *Didascalia*, in illustration of the exegesis. No knowledge of Greek is necessary in order to read and study the book from cover to cover.

The Rev. C. J. Barker's *The Johannine Epistles* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.), is the latest of a series of commentaries designed to meet the needs of the ordinary Bible reader who desires to discover the relevance of the Bible

to today. A brief introduction deals with the historical and religious background of the Epistles. The text used is the Revised Version. The commentary is admirably suited to its purpose. At the end there is a valuable list of references to other Biblical passages which invite comparison with the main themes of the First Epistle.

Many lovers of the Bible will welcome the appearance of a British edition of Prof. E. J. Goodspeed's *How to Read the Bible* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), which was published in America in 1946. The book does not attempt to epitomize the contents of the Bible, "but to help the reader to find its chief values for himself". Because the Bible is not so much a book as a library of books, the best way to read it is not to start with the first chapter of *Genesis* and work through to the last chapter of *Revelation*. Prof. Goodspeed treats the writings of both Testaments (and most of those of the Apocrypha) according to their literary form as biography, oratory, history, poetry, and so on. At the end there are sections on the historical background, chronology, and English Bibles. A splendid piece of work, and warmly to be commended.

The Rev. Wallace Deane, in *The Personality of Jesus* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.), writes reverently and sometimes movingly in an attempt "to describe what appear to be genuine reactions and progressions in the mental life" of Jesus. The main divisions are "Reactional", "Emotional", "Volitional", and "Ideational". Although written from a non-critical standpoint, much of the Fourth Gospel being employed as on a par with the Synoptists, the author is aware of the difficulties involved, and, without offering much help himself, advises the reader as far as possible to give the correct relative values to the various passages adduced. None the less, he not infrequently adheres to minority views, as that Jesus cleansed the temple twice. When psychology has done its work, there remains the inexplicable in man, and of no one is this truer than of Jesus, with His unique claims to authority. The book is marked by its devotional spirit rather than by originality or profundity.

Dr. William Robinson's *The Biblical Doctrine of the Church* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 12s. 6d.), consists of eight lectures delivered at Butler University, Indianapolis, with the addition of three appendices on the Church in *Hebrews, 1 Peter,* and *Revelation.* Written in an easy and attractive style, the book has "the aim of helping forward the work of understanding between Protestants and Catholics which is necessary to the emergence of that *una sancta,* which in our day is most desirable, not only because the Lord wills it, but because that without it the world can hardly be saved from perishing". As a member of the Churches of Christ, which he regards as a bridge between Protestantism and Catholicism, the author has special qualifications for the task. Apostolicity belongs to the whole Church, not to a hierarchy within it, and it is maintained by the Church's faithfulness to the apostolic teaching, and not by an episcopal succession of the ministry. Dr. Robinson holds a high view of the Church; what he has to say of a certain type of Congregationalism will get a mixed reception.

A. J. B. Higgins.

The best introduction to Existentialism known to me is a series of lectures by Martin Buber on "What is man?" published in English in the volume *From man to man.* But I commend as an alternative a lecture by Jean-Paul Sartre on *Existentialism and Humanism* to which is prefixed a useful introduction by the translator, Mr. Philip Mairet (Methuen, 5s.). Whatever people think of M. Sartre's conclusions about life, they ought not to deny

the stimulus of his mind. He is a theological atheist who believes in the freedom and responsibility of man in decisive action, and this is a welcome relief from the scientific atheist, who sees the meaning of life in the objectivity of knowledge.

Theologically, M. Sartre may be described as an anti-predestinationist. Here his contention that "what man needs is to find himself again and to understand that nothing can save him from himself, not even the valid proof of the existence of God" is surely right. The problem which he poses to the Christian theologian is that of the relation of the Son to the Spirit—if we are free to be led into new truth, how can the meaning of life be given already in Christ? What M. Sartre needs to understand is that too exclusive and triumphant a preoccupation with any one thing, *e.g.* the grace of God or the organic unity of the Church as well as the freedom of man, defeats its own end. But what a stimulating person he is!

If anyone turns to the Forwood Lectures of the late Professor John Laird entitled *On Human Freedom* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) with the idea that he will read a soul-stirring discussion of moral or political issues, he will be disappointed. But if he wants to read a discussion of the various senses in which we can rightly use the term "freedom," given by a particularly honest mind, here is rich fare. Professor Laird called himself an undogmatic determinist, but the ordinary reader can be comforted by learning that "to act "at will" is the vulgar conception of freedom of action. Philosophers should respect this vulgar conception, not because it is vulgar but because it describes fact". Dr. Laird thinks of pantheism as one of the strongest forms of theism, but Christians should not, on that account, neglect this pertinacious attempt to think clearly, which is always lucid and enlightened by a quiet humour. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Rev. E. C. Dewick covers a great amount of ground in *The Gospel and other Faiths* (Canterbury Press, 6s.) for he considers the attitudes of the Old Testament, Jesus, the Early Church, and the Church before and after the Reformation towards other faiths before considering the modern attitude. The comprehensiveness of Mr. Dewick's knowledge and the conciseness with which he states it make the review notable and valuable. His comments on the principles which should determine the attitude of Christian missions to other faiths today are spiritually discerning, and emphasize the uniqueness of the Christian Gospel without an unattractive intolerance. Missionaries and potential missionaries should read this book, which would prove very useful also to groups studying the faiths of mankind.

These African Copper Miners (Livingstone Press, 6s.) is an account of the peoples of Northern Rhodesia and their ways of life before and after the advent of industrialization, written by the Rev. R. J. B. Moore during his last illness, in 1942-3. Where revision and extension have become necessary, to bring the account up to date, this has been done by the Rev. A. Sandilands, who, in particular, has added statistical appendices. This book is a model of its kind: the past and present circumstances of the natives are graphically described; and the evidence of facts and figures makes it "an eloquent protest and moving appeal" on their behalf.

The Cross Over Asia (Canterbury Press, 8s. 6d.) is a review by Bishop Stephen Neill of the three months' visit to the non-Roman Churches of the Far East, which he paid in 1948 as the Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches and personal representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Neill writes in an interesting manner about his experiences and impressions. He is most impressed by the rapid emergence

of the younger Churches in the East, then by the immensity of their opportunities and—the weakness of their striking force.

The life of the General Director of the China Inland Mission from 1900 to 1935, who was appointed by Hudson Taylor as his successor to the office, is related in *D. E. Hoste* (China Inland Mission, 9s. 6d.) by Miss Phyllis Thompson. Hoste went out to China as one of the "Cambridge Seven" in 1885. He was a singularly pure spirit who, though by nature reserved, and holding himself somewhat aloof from his fellow men, was clearly suited for a position demanding spiritual leadership of a high quality. This he gave unstintingly, and the years of his directorship were years of continuing expansion and development for the Mission. Extracts from letters by Hoste and a selection of his writings are included.

The life and work of another servant of Christ through the China Inland Mission is related in *George Hunter : Apostle of Turkestan* (China Inland Mission, 7s. 6d.) by the Misses Mildred Cable and Francesca French. The text is finely illustrated. Hunter cannot have been an easy man to get to know, indeed in his lifetime he had very few intimate friends. From childhood he experienced loneliness, but this nurtured his inner resources and self-reliance. He was thereby fitted for the often lonely and exacting missionary journeys he undertook in Turkestan. There was, at times, an unattractive narrowness about his outlook, which sprang in part from the intensity and singleness of heart with which he served his Lord. He was in the tradition of the great pioneer missionaries.

In *This is China* (Muller, 15s.) the Rev. H. B. Rattenbury considers what in essence is China, the China which is permanent amidst change. In some thirty chapters he reviews the Chinese, their ways of life and traditional social relationships. His approach is often through personal reminiscence, conveyed in a lively style, and there are some splendid photographic illustrations.

In *Health and Healing* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) Miss Phyllis L. Garlick does well to remind us of the new insights of the Gospel into a true valuation of human personality which have inspired the Christian contribution to healing. Her plea for a new sense of responsibility among Christian people to share in the ministry of healing deserves support, especially from those who in private and public speech have the opportunity of determining others' vocations and mental attitudes.

Where Aloes Flame (Lutterworth Press, 10s. 6d.), by Dr. R. H. W. Shepherd, Principal of Lovedale Missionary Institution, is a study of present and past Christian missions in South Africa and the issues now facing them. After a few charming vignettes of mission life today, the writer sketches the background of the present by relating briefly the life and work of some of the missionary pioneers in South Africa. How their vision is being fulfilled and how the needs of the present are in part being met is made clear by a description of Lovedale. This book is a testimony to the contribution that Christian missions are making to a better world.

Dr. J. F. Carrington's *Talking Drums of Africa* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 5.) is a fascinating, if somewhat specialist, work, based on the findings of investigators in recent years and on his own experience. Drum language is essentially the same as spoken language: both are based upon the tonal pattern of words, and the two-toned wooden or skin-topped talking drum is used for the transmission of a variety of messages, different styles of beating denoting the nature of the message. Some earlier accounts of the vast distances at which drums could be heard have now been discredited. Alas! also, "the rising generation . . . shows an eagerness to acquire the new skills of the white man", and native youths are becoming less anxious to learn the drum language.

Miss Helen T. Miller's first historical novel, *Dark Sails* (Dublin: The National Press, 10s. 6d.), has its setting in St. Simon's, an island near the mouth of the Altamaha, Georgia, in the period when Spain was thrusting north and England southwards, and a testing of their strength was realized as inevitable. In a story agreeably and necessarily coloured with romance and adventure, Miss Miller relates how the climax was reached in the battle of Bloody Marsh, decisively won by the British. Charles and John Wesley's missionary labours in Georgia have their place in the narrative, which is very ably written.

Here Greatness Stands (Lutterworth Press, 5s.), by the Rev. McEwan Lawson, is a brilliant biography and character-study of Abraham Lincoln. Written in popular style it yet contains an immense amount of information about the man and times in which he lived. It is a fine book about a great man that everybody will feel better for reading.

It can hardly be said that Mr. L. E. Jones' *Jesus : Discoverer and Genius* (Macmillan, 4s. 6d.) is a successful attempt to reintroduce modern youth to Jesus "as a Human Being". The person portrayed, the discoverer of new truths about God and man, "the greatest moral genius that ever lived", tends at times to be somewhat remote and impersonal; though Mr. Jones does write very freshly about some of the new truths that Jesus "discovered".

John Smith's Book (James Clarke, 7s. 6d.) contains selections from the Popular Reports of the Bible Society from 1933 to 1947, written by the Rev. John A. Patten. The authority and influence of the Bible in personal and national life is impressively recorded in Mr. Patten's gifted writing.

HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

To forget our fathers in the faith is, individually and corporately, dangerous and impoverishing. In Dr. Albert Peel's *The Congregational Two Hundred* (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.) is far more than a prophylactic, and certainly not a soporific medicine. Compact, reliable and challenging, these biographical sketches of "Congregationalists who were eminent in any field (and) those who were eminent within Congregationalism" afford a wealth of vital illustrative material for teacher and preacher, a fascinating book for the general reader, and a valuable compendium for the student. Incorporating his earlier *Hundred Eminent Congregationalists* (1927)—many of these revised and supplemented—Dr. Peel's second century is peculiarly welcome for its inclusion of some 75 American "worthies" whose names and work ought to be better known on this side of the Atlantic and for sketches of some who have joined the great majority during the past two decades. If God makes fewer giants but elevates the race, there are still great names and greater souls, "true heroes of their age", whom even thus to know is to be inspired, and this Congregational "Who was Who" is to be warmly commended.

Alderman E. A. Blaxill's *Nonconformist Churches of Colchester* (Colchester: Borough Museum & Muniment Committee, 1s.) provides a concise outline story of a baker's dozen of the town's Dissenting communities, four of them founded in the 17th century, which might profitably be emulated by other municipal authorities interested in their local history. There are one or two unfortunate slips—factual and literal—and the facsimile signature (p. 8) purporting to be that of George Fox does not appear to be his.

CHARLES E. SURMAN.

The Social Application of Christianity (Duckworth, 5s.) by Mr. Guy Kendall, a former headmaster of University College School, is concerned with Christian social principles and how they have worked out or failed to

work out in history. After discussing such problems as wealth and property, military service, trade and usury, and the family, the writer concludes with a chapter on "Marx or Christ". This is an interesting and well documented book.

Canon S. L. Greenslade in *The Church and the Social Order* (S.C.M., 6s.) gives an historical survey of what the Church has done in the economic, social and political spheres. He shows that throughout the Christian era there has always been a remnant who have had a passion for social righteousness.

Twenty-five authorities are brought together by Mr. W. Shewring in *Rich and Poor in Christian Tradition* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.). Great diversity of treatment is found in their approach. There is the clear logic of Thomas Aquinas, the passionate denunciations of Ambrose, and the deep piety of Thomas à Kempis. The Biblical treatment of the subject is dismissed in three pages.

NORMAN CAVE.

The enterprises described in *International Voluntary Service for Peace, 1920-1946,* edited by Miss Ethelwyn Best and Mr. Bernard Pike (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), may be "infinitesimal on a world scale". They have, however, a significance for thinking Christians, and for those who have been helped. If work of this nature could be multiplied a thousand-fold, at least it is arguable that some of our problems would be less intractable. Even so, the amount of voluntary service undertaken, not only during open hostilities, but between the wars, is impressive. Many countries have been served—Holland, France, Wales, Sweden, Spain, India, Norway, Switzerland, England. . . . The story is a good one; it is to be regretted that material of this nature is not made available more cheaply, and that it lacks popular appeal. Such a book ought not to cost more than five shillings, should possess a much greater propaganda value, and needs a short, arresting title.

H. CUNLIFFE JONES.

The United Nations, by Dr. H. V. Evatt (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), is composed of a series of lectures delivered at Harvard University in the autumn of 1947. It describes the formation and the working of the United Nations and offers an estimate of the future. Dr. Evatt is Deputy Prime Minister of Australia and represented his country at meetings of the Assembly. He is much concerned to show how small countries can move the great by their enthusiasm and sense of international justice. The weakness of the book is that the author writes as a lawyer accustomed to argue a case and finish with it when a verdict has been given. He shows too little appreciation of the fact that the law needs an arm. The problem in international affairs is not to make treaties and agreements, but to ensure that in the stress of future events they will be allowed to mean what they were taken to mean when they were made. With these uncertainties Dr. Evatt is not concerned and his book is less useful than it might have been.

Everyman's United Nations (Mayflower, 7s. 6d.) is a comprehensive official handbook describing the constitution and work of the United Nations. Ministers, lecturers, youth leaders, teachers and all who want to be able to answer their own and other peoples questions about what U.N. is and does ought to have this book within reach. Mr. Trygve Lie writes a brief introduction.

Makers of Modern Thought, by the Rev. G. O. Griffith (Lutterworth Press, 15s.), is a companion volume to the same author's *Interpreters of Man.* A short essay on the Mediaeval Background is followed by sketches, each in

two parts, of nine men and their contributions to our intellectual inheritance—Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Rousseau, Comte, Marx, T. H. Huxley and Freud (why is Isaac Newton omitted?) As always, Mr. Griffith is easy and rewarding to read, sound and scholarly in his appraisements. His book is meant for the general reader, who will find it interesting in itself and trustworthy as an introduction to more serious study.

The Church of Rome—a Dissuasive (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.), by the Rev. Richard Hanson and Reginald Fuller, is an able, but in many respects limited, examination of the claims and practices of the Roman Catholic Church by two "convinced Anglicans who believe that the Church of England has the resources to provide a better answer to the pretensions of the Church of Rome than the Continental Reformers were able to give." They address the members of their own communion who are in danger of being deceived by these pretensions, and within the limits of a small book argue cogently, reminding the hesitant of "the power complex" in faith and morals, which makes it impossible for a devout Catholic to be a Biblical scholar, recognizes no marriage as valid that is not solemnized in a Roman Catholic Church, and regards the "other Christian bodies" (with two exceptions), not merely as schismatics but heretics. The argument of Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine* is scrutinized with some care. But there is far stronger case to be made, both doctrinally and practically, against Roman "pretensions" than is attempted in this book.

J. M. Phillips.

To republish representative pamphlets is an enterprise which surely deserves to be commended; but the fact that all but six of the 25 pieces selected for vol. i (1558-1776) of *British Pamphleteers* (Allen Wingate, 16s.) are extracts makes it imperative to have confidence in the editor's perspective and competence. For perspective, we have this, in Mr. George Orwell's introduction: "All the pamphlets . . . are really volleys in a single great battle. It is the battle of Catholic against Protestant, Feudalism against Capitalism" and this from an editorial note by Mr. Reginald Reynolds: "The Dissenters, however, being even more intent on persecuting Catholics than on obtaining freedom from persecution themselves, held with the Whigs." The competence, unfortunately, is not convincing. The one early plea for religious toleration offered is a digression in the scurrilous *Leicesters Commonwealth* (1584). Cardinal Allen's *Yeelding up of the Citie of Daventrie* (1587) "so far as we are aware has not been reprinted"; but it has, by the Chetham Society (1851). Again, of the Leveller tract *Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (1648), "no edition of this pamphlet has been published since the original one"; but one has, in Prof. G. H. Sabine's edition of *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley* (1941), and comparison reveals minor textual discrepancies. Peter Chamberlen's *Poor Mans Advocate* and Winstanley's *True Levellers Standard* "were both published in April 1650 (1649 old style)"; but April 1649 is April 1649 by any style. The anonymous author of *Tyranipocrit Discovered* (1649) "had something in him closely akin to the Quakers. He tells his readers that he has 'not written anything, through hate to any person'." We hope these strictures may be accepted in such a spirit (Mr. Reynolds is himself a Quaker); but the correlation suggests small acquaintance indeed with contemporary Quaker pamphlets! The book is well produced. The subject deserved more careful workmanship.

John Hales of Eton (King's Crown Press; London: Cumberlege, 14s.), an outstanding and significant figure in liberal thinking or Latitudinarianism, has been made the subject of a careful study by Mr. J. H. Elson. "If

Hales was skeptical of the grounds of Roman authoritarianism, he was equally skeptical of the ecclesiastical authority claimed by the Laudians." He believed in "man's rational ability to achieve independently the necessary degree of truth." "It is impossible," he wrote, "where scripture is ambiguous, that all conceits should run alike." Later Dissenters gladly made use of Hales' great name in their polemics, though Mr. Elson points out the incongruity "in the juxtaposition of Hales's aristocratic humanism and the strong desire for religious and economic betterment manifested in the Dissenter cause."

Burning enthusiasm as well as sceptical detachment was to be found in seventeenth century England. Many believed that the power of the Holy Spirit to heal diseases was as accessible for themselves as for New Testament Christians. Of this we are reminded by Professor H. J. Cadbury's edition of *George Fox's "Book of Miracles"* (Cambridge Press, 21s.). The book is a remarkable achievement in literary detection. From the references, in a MS. which he unearthed in 1932, to 171 "miracles" performed by Fox as recorded in a lost "Book of Miracles," Dr. Cadbury has reconstructed the lost book's outline, and added extensive footnotes. In a lengthy introduction he relates Fox's claim to miraculous powers to its contemporary context. The book is a model of printing as well as of editing and is finely illustrated and indexed.

Dr. Cadbury has also transcribed from a MS. preserved at York 33 letters to and from the early Quaker preacher William Dewsbury (1621-88) and his wife. These *Letters to William Dewsbury* (Bannisdale Press, 5s.) document further the beginnings of Quakerism, but rarely illuminate the wider world.

Another work of value for its dependence on MS. sources is Dr. Edward Carpenter's *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times* (S.P.C.K., 30s.). After being Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields and Bishop of Lincoln, Tenison was Archbishop from 1694 to 1715. The MSS. at Lambeth preserve a wide correspondence with Burnet, Lloyd, Stillingfleet, Sharp, Simon Patrick and Narcissus Marsh among his brother bishops; foreign divines such as Jablonski and Turretin; scholars like John Wallis, William Whiston and the Warden of All Souls (of which college the Archbishop was Visitor *ex officio*); Dodwell among the Nonjurors; writers in Virginia, St. Helena and the Barbadoes; politicians such as Harley; and, not least, the Electress Sophia. These letters treat of the live issues of the day: the Catholic menace—"Catholicism was, and remained till the end of his days, his major fear"; comprehension of the Dissenters, by whom (Calamy says) Tenison was "honoured and respected"; the nonjuring controversy; the struggle in Convocation; clandestine marriages; the founding of the S.P.G.; and the problem of the royal succession. In all these matters politics loomed large, "and *quieta non movere* was as much his own as Sir Robert Walpole's motto." His biographer admits that "of Tenison's private life he knows really nothing." Swift called Tenison "the dullest good for nothing man I ever knew," and with the best will in the world Dr. Carpenter hardly succeeds in making the archbishop other than dull. But he must be thanked for a clear and frank account of Tenison's official interests and activities, with many insights by the way into his "time."

"It was a sly trick of fate to give Patrick Brontë a Unitarian for his daughter Charlotte's biographer and a Puseyite for that daughter's husband." Mrs. G. Elsie Harrison believes she has found *The Clue to the Brontës* (Methuen, 14s.) in "the concentrated essence of old Methodism." *Jane Eyre* "might be called erotic Methodism"; *Wuthering Heights* "is

Methodist passion of the old school employed as the means of expression for the love of a man and a maid." "The Methodists were cruel in their soul probings," and so is Mrs. Harrison, as readers of *Son to Susannah* will remember; but it is all very exciting, and the evidence, starting from Patrick Brontë's Irish background, is, cumulatively, convincing. The book is well illustrated but is disfigured by frequent misprints (or worse).

Lord Acton comes under consideration again in a Historical Association pamphlet (G. Philip, 1s. 6d.). Here he is shown by Professor H. Butterfield as "a hurt lion, with painful inner scars," "ridden by manias sometimes," with "his inclination to look for the seamy" side—"even a streak of melodrama"—and with "hardnesses and obsessions in his later years."

Mrs. Janet Whitney, whose *Elizabeth Fry* was received so warmly, has fittingly gone on to write of *Geraldine S. Cadbury, 1865-1941* (Harrap, 12s. 6d.), who once said Elizabeth Fry was her patron saint. "Geraldine Cadbury did probably more for delinquent children than anybody in this country or in any other," said Mr. Chuter Ede at the opening of the remand home established near Birmingham in her memory, and the book is both valuable and cheering as a study of pioneer work in this connection. It also has the virtue of showing Dame Geraldine as a live personality with many interests outside children's courts, and with her "own children . . . her constant norm."

One could not travel in a railway carriage opposite Sir Hugh Allen without realizing that, whoever he was, "he emphatically was a big man." Very evidently possessing the artistic temperament, brusque, impatient, tempestuous, he was at once Professor of Music at Oxford and Director of the Royal College of Music. Many besides "Allen's young men" will enjoy Dr. Cyril Bailey's frank biography of his friend, *Hugh Percy Allen* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.). It includes the moving address given at Allen's funeral by the Warden of New College.

It is part of Sir Ernest Barker's modesty that "the story of my education," *Father of the Man* (5s.), is published "as a piece of social history" by the National Council of Social Service. The story opens in a four-roomed cottage, with a mother claiming "my greatest and sovereign debt" and (eventually) six younger children; moves on to Manchester Grammar School; and ends with Balliol. It is a wonderful story, told with winning frankness, yet with not a trace of the bitterness which marred Mr. Rowse's comparable *A Cornish Childhood*. We may be proud of Sir Ernest's grateful references to F. J. Powicke at "the Congregational chapel to which all the family belonged" and to Fairbairn at Mansfield College.

In writing his autobiography, Dr. J. T. Inskip, the Suffragan Bishop of Barking, has hoped to convince its readers "that a clerical career deserves as much as any other the title of" *A Man's Job* (Skeffington, 12s. 6d.). *A Clerical Career* would have been a better title. It is curious to find a book so full of detail, yet seemingly so lacking in significance. Only one fact will stick: on his consecration "a Suffragan Bishop has to pay £20 to the Crown Office and £8 to the Home Office."

Since 1092 the Lancelyns and their descendants the Green(e)s have lived at Poulton-Lancelyn in the Wirral. Now, here as elsewhere, "the whole estate must be mortgaged and the house let." It is a sad conclusion; but in *Poulton-Lancelyn* (Oxford: Oxonian Press, 7s. 6d.), Mr. Roger Lancelyn Green tells "the story of an ancestral home" bravely as well as lovingly, as he conducts the reader round the Hall, opening here parchments and pedigrees, there an old book or a ledger.

Another book like Miss Elizabeth Bowen's *Bowen's Court* in being written round a "great house" is Miss Dorothy Devenish's *A Wiltshire Home: A Study of Little Durnford* (Batsford, 12s. 6d.); but it is confined to a single period, that of childhood's memories, and is written more after the manner of Miss Edith Olivier, who suitably added a commendatory foreword. While lacking Miss Olivier's wit and lightness of touch, the writer effectively evokes "a sense of security and belonging." Her story is set off by 59 charming photographs, with a reproduction of an oil painting for frontispiece, and maps of the garden and grounds for endpapers. This is a book one buys to give away, but keeps. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

In *The Road to Stratford* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) Mr. Frank O'Connor is always stimulating and often unorthodox, not to say disconcerting, though never unreasonable. He is not alone in thinking *Antony and Cleopatra* the greatest of the tragedies, but one wonders how many readers he will persuade that *Othello* and *Lear* are 'failures'. In the last plays he sees, apart from the wonderful poetry, not peace, not resignation even, but 'weariness'. They are not the testament of a converted pessimist, but 'the stoicism of an old fighter with his back to the wall'. Mr. O'Connor shows that the poet and practising dramatist can sometimes step in with confidence where the scholar, pure and simple, fears to tread.

Dame Una Pope-Hennessy's *Sir Walter Scott* (Home & Van Thal, 6s.), a recent addition to the English Novelists Series, is divided into two parts, 'The Man' and 'The Work'. It is perhaps unlikely to encourage new readers to attempt the Waverley Novels, though it contains much to interest those already familiar with them, and with the standard biographies of their author. Dame Una devotes much ingenuity to a discussion of the difficult problem of the chronology of Scott's writings, and too much space (in so short a book) to tracing the growth of his knowledge of Roman Catholic ritual.

The originals of the *New Shelley Letters* (Bodley Head, 10s. 6d.), edited by Mr. W. S. Scott, belong to the family of Shelley's friend and biographer, T. J. Hogg, and range in date from 1811 to 1844. Shelley is not among the great letter-writers, and in general his is the least interesting contribution to this collection. Most charming, and of more general interest as letters, are those, some startlingly intimate, from Mary Shelley to Hogg, signed 'a very naughty Dormouse', 'a Runaway Dormouse', or simply 'Your affectionate Dormouse'. Only less entertaining is the correspondence between Hogg and Thomas Love Peacock.

Marcel Proust: A Selection from his Miscellaneous Writings (Wingate, 10s. 6d.) contains 15 essays, chosen (chiefly from *Pastiches et Mélanges*) and translated by Mr. Gerard Hopkins. It is difficult for a confirmed Proustian to judge this book on its own merits, since almost all Proust's essays concern themes later treated at length in his great novel. Remarkable though they are, such pieces as "White May; Pink May" and "Sunlight on a Balcony" can be of little more than academic interest to readers familiar with "Swann's Way" and "Time Regained". But anyone who has so far failed to discover Proust should be stimulated by reading this little book to attempt the greater. Most of the essays (apart from those on Ruskin, Flaubert and Baudelaire) have been chosen to illustrate the lyrical aspect of Proust's genius. Mr. Hopkins claims that too much attention has been paid to Proust as a psychologist at the expense of Proust the poet. This book should help to redress the balance.

Three of the twelve friends commemorated by Miss Hilda Martindale in

Some Victorian Portraits (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) were Congregationalists. Miss Martindale has been an eminent Civil servant, and while her portraits include a clergyman, a doctor, a faithful maid, and, in Sir Francis Younghusband, at least one well-known figure, her emphasis is on the Civil Service. It is pleasing to find someone who admires so many people so unstintedly, but a book made up of little else but praise is apt to give more satisfaction to the writer than to the reader.

Lovers of the horse will enjoy *Bygones* (Lewes: Baxter, 10s. 6d.), the recollections, exclusively equine, of Mr. Dick Hunt, who began life as a veterinary student among London's bus horses, and was for many years a jobmaster in Brighton. His rather random jottings, introduced by Lord Leconfield, include descriptions of famous road coaches, their teams and patrons, and a life of E. K. Fownes, the 'supreme coachman', who died in 1943, aged 92. P. A. SPALDING.

The story of the Celtic Church is delightfully told by Miss Diana Leathem in *They Built On Rock* (Glasgow: Celtic Art Society, 15s.). Its unique organization, methods, form and achievements deserved a wider popular knowledge, and these are well shown here in the lives of the Celtic Saints. Its origins and development are traced from the Desert Fathers, through St. Martin to Ninian, Brendan, Columba, Cuthbert and others. Miss Leathem's love of the miraculous may offend some readers; but her scholarship is sound, her style is clear and attractive, and the book itself is well produced by a sympathetic publisher.

Bishop Turgot, in his biography, called Queen Margaret of Scotland "A pearl, precious in faith and works", and Mrs. A. M. D. Henderson-Howat has called her story of Margaret's life and times *Royal Pearl* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.). It is a great story. Margaret was obviously a gracious wife, a noble Queen, a saintly woman. It is also obvious that Mrs. Howat is determined to make her gem shine as brightly as possible. The book is rather repetitive, and the scathing condemnations of the Reformers of a later day grow especially wearying. We note that Miss Leathem claims the doctrine and tradition of the Celtic Church for Rome. Mrs. Howat repeatedly asserts that the Episcopalian Church of Scotland is the receptacle of the tradition of the Celtic Church as revivified and reformed by Queen Margaret, and "in spite of the foreign imposition of the presbyterian system"! We now await the necessary reassertion, by (say) Dr. George Macleod, of the claims of the Reformed Kirk of Scotland to the inheritance of the glories of Celtic Christianity.

There are few adults who understand the emotions and thoughts of the child, or faithfully remember those of their own childhood. Mr. Lawrence Hanson shows himself one of these privileged few in his autobiographical record of childhood, *Shining Morning Face* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). The intense emotional sensibility of the young boy, only too often raised almost to breaking point by inability to find expression in words, is sympathetically revealed by the imaginative and analytic skill of the grown man and writer. This is a book to be read, especially by parents, child-psychologists and all those who are concerned for healthy family relationships.

The Great Tradition (Chatto & Windus, 12s. 6d.), of which Dr. F. R. Leavis writes, is that of the few really great English Novelists—"the major novelists who count in the same way as the major poets, in the sense that they not only change the possibilities of the art for practitioners and readers, but that they are significant in terms of the human awareness they promote; awareness of the possibilities of life". These happy few are Jane Austen, George Eliot, Henry James and Joseph Conrad; with the possible later

addition of D. H. Lawrence. Eliot, James and Conrad are dealt with in detail. Dr. Leavis is well aware that there are other great novels and other writers of genius; but these few alone, he contends, are in the tradition defined. This is valuable critical work which amply repays the study it demands.

Mr. R. Scott Frayn knows most of the tricks of the trade and is ready to try his hand at a great variety of forms of verse; but, alas, *Suspended Chords* (Epworth Press, 3s.) is only too apt a title for his collection of religious verse. There is a failure of poetic imagination and passion; but at least he aims far higher than much of the sentimental jog-trot at present turned out as religious verse.

Mr. R. M. Lockley describes himself as at heart a true peasant; he is also a distinguished naturalist and a successful farmer—as far as any farmer is ever successful. We have grown familiar with his Island Farm in previous books, and may delight in his latest production telling of the round of the year in stock-raising, crop-production and the observation of birds and flowers. His book is at once personal, reflective and sufficiently technical—no vague technicolor rhapsodies of the amateur country-lover here, any more than there is vagueness in his literary style. Here is a record of the year 1947 which began with devastation and loss in the great blizzard, which continued with worries and delays and a summer drought that enabled easy harvesting of only a medium crop, but which Mr. Lockley daringly and thankfully calls *The Golden Year* (Witherby, 10s. 6d.).

Mr. Walter Wilkinson has been on the road again with his barrow, complete with puppet show and camping equipment, which before the war he pushed through Yorkshire, Scotland and even America. Now he gives us a racy account of *Puppets In Wales* (Bles, 8s. 6d.). Perhaps the years have begun to take their toll, for the hills seem longer and steeper than ever and the puppets stay in their box most of the time instead of popping out to give a casual performance at almost every other village. But Mr. Wilkinson saunters pleasantly through Wales, ready to change his direction or his mood with the veering wind and to discuss anything under the sun with amusing exaggeration.

An acceptable presentation book for children and others is *The Legend of Glastonbury* (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.), told in verse by A. G. Chant and in pictures by Mr. H. J. Knowles.

A Craftsman's Anthology made by the late Mr. A. Romney Green and edited and abridged by Miss Joan Yeo (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) reveals the compiler even more clearly than usual. His object, he writes, was to find "memorable expression for the best living tendencies of thought" from those passages that had remained in his mind through years of unsystematic reading. It is apparent that this reading included a great deal of Nietzsche, Emerson and Carlyle.

Lady Peck gives us a generous mixture in her new novel, *Arrest The Bishop?* (Faber, 9s. 6d.). It is a crime novel, with an incredible Scots Chief Constable, amateur detective and deathbed confession. Its setting is a Bishop's Palace, with a strong flavour of Trollope or Hugh Walpole. Its period is post World War I, with gay young emancipated things, social upheaval, and, My Dear, the Servant Problem! Lady Peck seems to know well the little world of which she writes with no small skill.

The Missionary, by Miss Cornelia Spencer (Harrap, 10s.), is a novel of American Mission work in China. The Missionary of the title is a man who doesn't believe in the more or less orthodox Christianity of his colleagues but only in his "gospel of human kindness". We are told that he understands the Chinese far better than all the others (including his long-suffering wife),

except for the newly-arrived wife of another missionary, with whom he promptly falls in love and she with him. They nobly and sentimentally renounce each other. Miss Spencer is better than her creations. She does appear to the outsider to have considerable understanding of China, and her portrait of the Mission is less unsympathetic than that of some writers.

K. W. WADSWORTH.

A Short History of Jewish Art, by Miss Helen Rosenau (James Clarke, 15s.), is a well documented and illustrated treatment of the nature and development of Jewish art in architecture, painting, sculpture, ritual objects, fittings and ornaments. It shows clearly that the formal aspect of Jewish art was constantly adapted to the æsthetic environment without betrayal of the inherent characteristics of Jewish religion and life. W. D. DAVIES.

The World Turned Upside Down by Clive Sansom (Muller, 5s.) gives an interesting modern interpretation of the Nativity story. Written in free verse, full of purpose and freshly expressed ideas, this play should commend itself to those readers who like the unusual approach; but to be acted or even read aloud it would demand an equally unusual standard of producer, players *and* audience.

Six Short Religious Plays by Vera Arlett, Frank Buchanan, Alan Poole, Elisabeth Hewart and J. L. Mortimer (Religious Drama Society, S.P.C.K., for 4s.) are good examples of the newer type of religious drama. The themes range from Adam and Eve at the Gate of Eden, by way of two episodes in the discipleship of Peter, glimpse of St. Basil of Trèves and a legend of a Lenten fast in a mediæval setting, to a final picture of courage and sacrifice in the war days of 1942. All are good, but Miss Arlett's "Mother of all living," written in blank verse, is a particularly sensitive piece of work. KATHLEEN NESBITT.

The publisher's "blurb" on the dust jacket of Mr. Rom Landau's *Human Relations* (Faber, 16s.) refers to the book as "this vast survey" and promises "most detailed discussions on the dilemmas and impasses that tend to fear, despair, and the habit of half-living". That it surveys a vast area of life cannot be gainsaid, for nothing seems to be outside its scope. But the reader is likely to feel that instead of "most detailed discussions" he has been offered a few words on nearly every subject under the sun and that the treatment is generally of a superficial kind. Indeed, the real substance of the book could have been compressed into considerably fewer than its 363 pages, for the style is often wordy. It must be said that many of those who hope to find in the book the promised "mine of comfort" will certainly be disappointed.

The author of *Men and Women* (S.C.M., 6s.), Mr. Gilbert Russell, is both a parson and a doctor, and therefore should be particularly well qualified to write on this subject. He has given us a useful and well-written book. The author says it is not a book about sex but about men and women, and its great value is in its emphasis upon the fact (so often blurred in books on this subject) that marriage is in the fullest sense a personal relationship and that sex can be rightly understood and used only in this context.

L. J. TIZARD.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Jan.). An interesting number, with a pronounced topical flavour. Though written primarily with Methodism in mind, the Rev. Frederic Greeves' article—" 'Built up in our most holy faith' "—has practical value for all the denominations; it is soul-searching and suggestive. Two articles deal with the relation of the Faith to world issues: "Christianity and Communism," an assessment by the Rev. F. J. Foinette; and "The Church and International Affairs," a lucid comment by Mr. E. G. M. Fletcher, a Member of Parliament who attended Amsterdam. To the Freudian dictum that "the beginnings of religion, ethics, society, and art meet in the Oedipus complex," Dr. T. F. Glasson adds atheism; his article—"Atheism Psycho-analysed"—is an elaboration of this addition. The Rev. Frederick Hunter and the Rev. Frank Baker are jointly responsible for a dissertation on "The Origin of the Methodist Quarterly Meeting." A Congregationalist, the Rev. Harry Escott, has an article on "Isaac Watts: Nonconformist"; his recent book on P. T. Forsyth is a matter of editorial appreciation.

Expository Times (Dec.). Prof. R. H. Lightfoot continues the series of "Unsolved New Testament Problems" with an article on "The Cleansing of the Temple in St. John's Gospel." There are two excellent Amsterdam articles: "The Church and Society" by Mrs. Kathleen Bliss; and "The Churches and the International Disorder" by Mr. Kenneth G. Grubb.

International Review of Missions (Jan.). The outstanding feature is the editorial survey of 1948—an indispensable document of over 70 pages for anyone who wishes to possess reliable and up-to-date information about Christian missions. Despite the general shortage of workers which is reported, the overall picture "remains overwhelmingly one of the cumulative strength of Christian obedience, and of advance in the upbuilding of a living, witnessing Church." In "What Should a Missionary Know," the Rev. H. C. Stuntz replies to a recent criticism of missionary education by Dr. Frank Laubach. Dr. Karl Hartenstein, of Württemberg, writes interestingly on "The Third Way: An Interpretation and Criticism of Amsterdam." 40 pages are devoted to book reviews.

Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.). Dr. Duncan Fraser follows a well-trodden path in defining "The Preacher's Task in the Modern World" as declaratory, evangelistic, expository and doctrinal. An informative article by Mr. L. E. Porter on "The Agreed Syllabus," explains its scope, necessity, compilation and contents. The Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray writes on "Apocalyptic Literature and the Book of Revelation." Dr. C. S. Carter writes agreeably on "John Eliot, 1604-1690."

Review and Expositor (Oct.-Jan.). In "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Christian Hymns," the Rev. J. M. Lewis gives pride of place to Isaac Watts and Andrew Reed when dealing with the modern period. Prof. F. B. Edge on "An Experiential Philosophy of Religious Education" and the Rev. H. A. Brimm on "The Christian Task of Moral Education" share a not unrelated concern. Dr. J. A. Mackay deals with the problem of human rebellion ("When Man Wants to be God"), and the Rev. H. H. Barnette with "The Challenge of Southern Cities." Further contributions include Prof. E. A. McDowell's "Jesus and the Jewish Nation"; Prof. W. A. Mueller's "The Problematic of Historical Research"; and Prof. C. T. Francisco's "The Moral Message of the Hebrew Prophets."

Harvard Theological Review (July). Charles Edson's "Cults of Thessalonica (Macedonia III)" is for specialists; it runs to 52 pages and is illustrated with 7 excellent plates. "The American churches today share nothing in common as they share Watts"; that this was not always so is made clear by Robert Stevenson's well-informed article entitled "Watts in America".

Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). Dr. F. C. Grant pleads for due observance in preaching of the Christian Year; he deals especially with "The Christmas Message." Other contributors include Dr. A. H. Forster ("The Gospel according to the Epistles and the Gospel for the Present Day") and Bishop Barton ("Thoughts on Christian

Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). The controversy aroused by the Congregational-Presbyterian conversations lends interest to the publication of an official document by the Council of the Baptist Union entitled "The Baptist Doctrine of the Church." The Rev. I. J. Barnes writes on "The Missionary Motive"; the Rev. G. H. Woodham on "The Voice of God in History"; and the Rev. G. W. Hughes on Isaac Watts (an appreciation of his work as a hymn-writer). Of general interest also is Dr. A. de Bussey's address on "The English Church at Amsterdam."

H. CUNLIFFE JONES.